The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXXXVII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1933 No. 3562

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 393
EDITORIALS:
Shall Our Sugar Refiners Ruin Cuba? 395
Our Postal Subsidies to Shipping 396
Hitlerism Is Cracking 397
Hail, Exiled Scholars! 398
Ring Lardner 398
ISSUES AND MEN. GEORGE L. RECORD. By Oswald Garrison Villard 399
THE CRISIS IN RELIEF. By Edith Abbott 400
RECOVERY HITS A BAD WEEK. By Paul Y. Anderson . . . 402
RUSSIA: FEAR AND FOREIGN POLICY. By Louis Fischer . . 403
THE TRAINED NURSE AND THE DEPRESSION. By Carolyn Conant Van Blarcom 406
UTAH SEEKS ITS OWN NEW DEAL. By Murray E. King . . 408
IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 409
CORRESPONDENCE 410
FINANCE. THE NEW DEAL MAY PROTECT THE RAIL INVESTOR. By Peter Helmoop Noyes 411
CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE 412
BOOKS, FILMS, DRAMA:
First Day of Autumn. By Eda Lou Walton 413
"Fascism Is Capitalism." By Henry Hazlitt 413
How Great Was Shakespeare? By Joseph Wood Krutch . . . 414
Robinson's Women. By Eda Lou Walton 415
Rhodes's Dark Empire. By Isidor Schneider 415
Prices and Labor Under the NRA. By Paul H. Douglas . . . 416
The Romantic Agony. By William Troy 417
Shorter Notices 418
Films: Cinema Minus. By William Troy 419
Drama: An Event. By Joseph Wood Krutch 419

BOARD OF EDITORS

ERNEST GRUENING FREDA KIRCHWEY
HENRY HAZLITT JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

MARGARET MARSHALL MAURITZ A. HALLGREN

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD
CONTRIBUTING EDITOR

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States; to Canada, $5.50; and to other foreign countries, $6.00.

THE NATION, No. 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, New York. Muriel C. Gray, Advertising Manager. British Agent, Gertrude M. Cross, 23 Brunswick Square, London W. C. 1, England.

WILL the recovery machinery set up by the Roosevelt Administration be retained, though perhaps in modified form and under a new name, after—or if—the goal has been reached and prosperity restored? Or is it to be scrapped if—or when—economic recovery is achieved? This question, which naturally is based on the assumption that the Roosevelt program will in time restore prosperity, appears to have divided official Washington into two camps. The economic advisers of the Administration are for the most part convinced that the recovery machinery must be given more or less enduring form, while the political advisers are disposed to look upon the NRA and similar agencies as temporary affairs created solely for the purpose of meeting an emergency. The Administration itself inclines to the latter view, in any case when talking for publication. It is pointed out, when the question is raised, that virtually all the recovery laws will automatically expire at the end of one or two years. Of course, it may be that this position is taken merely to reassure many business men who still cling to their old faith in laissez faire and whose cooperation the White House and the NRA must have. For while NRA officials still talk in terms of the emergency, they are actually and quietly considering ways and means of changing the present emergency program into a permanent economic plan. To this end the Central Statistical Board has been charged with the task of gathering all data and statistics that may be essential to the formulation of a permanent plan. The Roosevelt Administration will be prepared to proceed in that direction, if and when it decides that such a course is necessary.

ECONOMIC PLANNING under centralized government authority may, in fact, be inevitable. But whether inevitable or not, the Roosevelt Administration must continue to move along the road chosen, that is, toward increased government supervision over and control of our economic activities. One can offer many arguments in support of this contention. One can say that in this era of machinery and mass production it has become impossible to proceed any farther along the road of individualism and economic anarchy; some sort of government supervision must take the place of laissez faire. One can say that big business is acquiring a valuable vested interest in the Roosevelt system, the right to combine, not in defiance of the government, but with its blessings, and that for this reason big business, which after all holds the only real economic power in the country, will become the strongest supporter of the Roosevelt policies. But one need only point out that Mr. Roosevelt cannot possibly turn back to laissez faire, to the do-nothing policy of Herbert Hoover. Imagine what a shock public confidence would receive if the President were to intimate that he was returning to Hooverism! He must go on, and the road can only lead to further concentration of economic power in the hands of the state. Whether such concentration ultimately develops into fascism or socialism depends considerably on the purpose and strength of character of the President. In any event, it is not only idle but misleading to suggest that the Roosevelt program is simply an emergency measure designed to tide us over until prosperity shall have been restored.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT laid down an important principle in his address to the American Legion at Chicago. After affirming the nation's responsibility to care for those who suffered injury or contracted disease while serving in its defense, and also for the dependents of those killed or incapacitated, he asserted that "no person because he wore a uniform must thereafter be placed in a special class of beneficiaries over and above all other citizens." He added that because a man has worn a uniform does not mean "that he can demand and receive from his government a benefit which no other citizen receives." Elaborating this further, he rejected emphatically the conception that veterans should receive compensation for injuries not definitely connected with the service. This is an important and courageous enunciation of the policy embodied in legislation last spring; it reverses flatly the policy of preceding Administrations and repudiates the view so successfully maintained by the American Legion itself. Logical and proper extension of this principle should eliminate the various preferences given to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

veterans, regardless of merit, in connection with government jobs. Its common sense is self-evident. But Franklin D. Roosevelt is the first President since the World War who has had the courage to enunciate it.

THE ONE BRIGHT SPOT in the relationship of the United States to Cuba is Secretary Hull's reiteration that American warships are charged solely with the duty of safeguarding the lives, not the property, of Americans and other foreigners. That is a far-reaching and praiseworthy departure from our past foreign policy in Latin America. It must come as a rude shock to some of the career men in the department, who have always considered the protection of American investments in the Caribbean and Central America the cardinal objective of our diplomacy. That their habits and traditions still shape our policy, despite the good intentions of their chief and the supposed new anti-imperialist outlook of the Roosevelt Administration, may be seen in the recently concluded agreement with Haiti, under which we insist on retaining financial control of that republic until the last cent of the National City Bank loan, forced upon the Haitians during the Harding Administration, has been retired. The American Civil Liberties Union has just issued an emphatic protest against this utilization of the diplomatic machinery of the United States for the collection of private debts. A similar though less drastic agreement, sought by the Hoover Administration a year ago, was unanimously rejected by the Haitian congress. At present the congress is not in session, but that it will act with equal emphasis when it reconvenes can scarcely be doubted. This mistaken policy, which will cost the United States far more in good-will throughout Latin America than the paltry $14,000,000 at issue, payment of which was assured in any event, conflicts in spirit with Secretary Hull's pronouncement in regard to the relative importance of life and property in Cuba. Fortunately the error can still be corrected.

THERE are several things to be said in favor of the Administration's plan to lend $25,000,000 to railroads directly out of the public-works fund to enable them to purchase new rails and new rolling stock. To begin with, this sort of expenditure is sounder in every respect than the sort of expenditure that is going into new battleships, for example. In the last four years the railroads, with shrinking revenues, have suffered a severe physical deterioration—perhaps so serious, in some instances, as to approach the point of endangering human life—and there can be no question of the urgent need of road-bed improvement and new locomotives and cars. Further, in so far as the loans advanced are sound, this is a type of expenditure that will stimulate the heavy industries and give employment without increasing the net burden of taxation or without a permanent increase in the national debt. The President is to be congratulated, too, for his insistence that there must be competitive bidding on the part of the steel companies for the rail orders and that the bids must be under the "standard" price of $40 a ton. The price of steel rails has been maintained during the depression and is now out of line not only with the price of other structural materials but even with the price of other steel products. It is a monopoly price maintained under at least a tacit threat, for the United States Steel Corporation holds a whip hand over individual railroads through its power to deflect its shipments from one road to another. Perhaps only governmental insistence could bring the price of steel rails down to a reasonable figure under present conditions. But with everything that may be said in favor of the new plan, one may still question the wisdom of pouring further government money into the railroads, without closer supervision, when so many of the loans will never be repaid.

THE ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION has not added to its stature by permitting Postmaster-General Farley to promote the McKee candidacy in New York City. This move is generally deemed to imperil the almost certain defeat for which the Curry-McCooey wing of Tammany was heading. That Mr. LaGuardia can likewise defeat the Farley-Flynn wing of the Wigwam seems, however, not improbable. It depends largely on the so-called silent vote, on the people who for years have failed to register to vote because of their conviction of their helplessness in previous elections to remove the Tammany blight. In 1929 only 44 per cent of the eligible New Yorkers voted. If any considerable part of this electorate goes to the polls on November 7, Mr. LaGuardia will be elected. The first task, therefore, of those interested in removing Tammany is to obtain the largest possible registration. Registration takes place from October 9 to 13 inclusive, from 5 to 10:30 p.m., and on Saturday, October 14, from 7 a.m. to 10:30 p.m. We urge *Nation* readers to enlist actively in this campaign. If each one of the 20,000 readers dwelling in Greater New York enlists his circle of friends and acquaintances, Mr. LaGuardia will be the next mayor. Seldom has an electorate had such an opportunity to register its desires and to determine the political fate of its community.

THE president of the Pennsylvania Railroad has "reduced" his salary to $60,000 a year. If now the NRA would issue a decree "reducing" the pay of everyone else in the country to the same amount, prosperity would emerge from around the corner at a gallop.

TO OUR MIND the United States Congress Against War, which assembled recently in New York City, was significant chiefly because of the union of Communists with other groups in a common project. The Socialist Party as such did not participate, but the organization in Philadelphia received permission to take part, and its delegation was greeted with cheers of genuine enthusiasm from the Communists when it entered the convention hall. Moreover, many members of the Socialist Party attended the congress as delegates of other organizations, such as the League for Industrial Democracy, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and the War Resisters' League. An assembly made up of such varied, and in many ways antagonistic, elements is always hard to direct and often acrimonious, but the Congress Against War showed that such a gathering can nevertheless work constructively provided the purpose is sufficiently single and is sincerely adhered to. Some 2,700 delegates from thirty-five States attended the congress, although only one union from the American Federation of Labor was represented—the Full-Fashioned Hosiery Workers. The American League Against War and Fascism was organized to carry out the program of the congress.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shall Our Sugar Refiners Ruin Cuba?

THE administration of President Ramon Grau San Martin is at this writing in its fourth week. Without recognition by the United States, it has endured longer than the preceding regime of Cespedes, which we recognized at once. Washington has to date followed the counsel of our Ambassador, Sumner Welles. It is natural and fitting that the Administration be largely guided by its Ambassador, who more than any other man in the State Department is considered expert in Cuban and Latin American affairs generally, and whose good-will toward the Cuban people may be taken for granted. Nevertheless, Mr. Welles is liable to error and has already given evidence of having misread the Cuban situation.

Withholding recognition to test the Grau regime's strength is a paradox not unlike permission to swim without going near the water. Given the disorganization of the island's political and economic fabric after seven years of atrophying tyranny, non-recognition presents any Cuban administration with an insuperable obstacle. Recognition would automatically promote stability. Our Ambassador's contention that the Grau government is not representative, that it is backed only by the students and the army, has a certain validity. Strengthening it by the inclusion of other groups, notably the A. B. C., is certainly desirable. But how much more effectively that could be urged after recognition and the friendly cooperation that such recognition implies! Moreover, to expect a truly representative regime to spring up after the destruction of democratic institutions by dictatorship exhibits a certain lack of realism. And while it is urged that to recognize an administration born of an army revolt in a country which until recently has not, like other Latin American nations, been cursed with a Pretorian army would establish an unfortunate precedent, that army is a legacy of the previous American policy and must be reckoned with. Moreover, nearly every government in Latin America today was brought to power by military revolt. Unquestionably the army will bedevil Cuba's national life until it is demobilized, but the first step to that end is to secure at the earliest moment a government with which we can whole-heartedly cooperate to solve the economic problems which lie at the root of all Cuba's troubles.

Those economic problems may be spelled in the five-letter word sugar. Since June 27 representatives of various sugar interests have been conferring in Washington under the sanction of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to formulate a new policy of controlled production. The geographical interests apparently in conflict have been domestic beet-sugar producers, represented in seventeen States of the Union but constituting only 2½ per cent of our farm population and receiving less than 1 per cent of the farm income; Louisiana cane growers; insular growers within our tariff wall in the Philippines, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico; and, finally, Cuba. The consumer interest of the 120,000,000 Americans, which should be first and foremost, has not even been represented. As for the interest of workers in the beet fields, which has ever been utilized by the sugar trust to obtain exorbitant tariff duties, there is no sign that the shocking exploitation of alien and child labor will be remedied. The interest of the Cuban growers, which more than any other has been sacrified by American policy but embodies an important domestic interest, since Cuba was once our fourth largest market, is not represented. The conferences have been dominated by domestic refiners, a small, powerful group of parasites who for years have collected tribute from the American consumer and from the laborer in the continental, insular, and Cuban sugar fields. The labor these refiners themselves employ is negligible, since refining is now chiefly a machine process. The proposed agreement, not yet officially announced, benefits no one but them, and their control of the conferences and of the proposed sugar stabilization board is a major scandal to which Secretary Wallace and the President should direct their immediate attention.

While limitation of production has, rightly or wrongly, been the objective of our agricultural policy, the domestic beet-sugar growers have been granted an enormously increased quota. Their production averaged a million tons from 1927 to 1931. The estimated crop for the current year is 1,450,000 tons. The beet-sugar quota proposed under an abandoned agreement of July 18 was 1,525,000 tons. This has now been raised to 1,750,000 tons. The Philippines are to have a quota of 1,100,000 tons of cane sugar, nearly double their production of five years ago. Meanwhile, the amount that Cuba, outside our tariff wall, supplies has dropped from half our domestic consumption from 1911 to 1931 to a quarter of it. The proposed quota of 2,000,000 tons is totally inadequate. It is 800,000 tons less even than under the Chadbourne agreement, which proved so detrimental to Cuba's economy and a failure in every other respect. Even more inexcusable is a provision limiting the importation of Cuban refined sugar to 250,000 tons, which would mean the closing of every Cuban refinery.

The folly of this pending policy is revealed in an examination of relative costs of production of Cuban sugar and of our "protected" sugar. The difference is approximately a cent and a half a pound. The American consumer pays that difference. But the benefit does not go, except in the minutest degree, to the American farmer. It goes to the group of capitalists which controls Hawaiian and Philippine sugar and to the stockholding group which owns the American refineries. Now the refiner is not a producer. He is merely a washer of the sugar already processed, and a distributor—a sort of super-middleman. The farmer not only does not gain by the present tariff protection and proposed quota policy—he actually loses. From 1925 to 1929 our exports to Cuba, largely agricultural products, averaged $150,000,000. In 1933 they will shrink to less than one-sixth of that figure. The situation calls for an increase in the Cuban quota of not less than 500,000 tons—a minimum of 2,500,000—and a corresponding decrease in other quotas. And that should be but a temporary expedient. What is imperatively needed is the abolition of our sugar tariff. This could be accomplished gradually—by a reduction of half a cent a year—with a minimum of disturbance and a maximum of benefit.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our Postal Subsidies to Shipping

THE Senate inquiry into our postal subsidies to shipping, which has begun in Washington, unearthed a pretty mess of scandals at the very first hearing and threatens many more sensations. Thus Senator Black's committee brought out that the Export Steamship Corporation received no less than $300,000 for carrying *four pounds of mail;* that in 1929 it was paid at the rate of $66,000 a pound under a contract awarded by the Hoover Administration; that the total subsidies paid to it in 1931, 1932, and 1933 amounted to considerably more than the sum it paid to the United States government for the eighteen vessels it purchased from the Shipping Board. In other words, the government gave back the purchase money in thirty-six months, and then some more, for practically no service rendered.

Other curious and illuminating facts brought out were that T. Bascom Slemp, secretary to President Coolidge, immediately after leaving that gentleman's employ brought about a reduction of the price asked for the eighteen ships from $8.50 to $7.50 a ton. For this service Mr. Coolidge's ex-secretary asked the modest fee of $50,000; the Export Corporation, unhappily, felt that this was a hold-up and paid him "only" $15,000. Even more interesting is the fact that a tailor's bill of $510, charged to T. V. O'Connor, chairman of the Shipping Board, turned up paid at the Export Line's New York office, although the head of the company, Henry Herbermann, denies having paid for the clothes. Then we have Mr. O'Connor's secretary, Mina G. Irvine, testifying that she kindly negotiated several Florida land deals for Mr. Herbermann. This agreeable person, it appears, also destroyed the records of these transactions after an agent of the Department of Justice had inquired about them. A note has survived, however, in which Mrs. Irvine requested $3,000 as a payment on a Florida land deal, suggesting that "the way the other was sent, in my opinion, is the best way to handle it."

These revelations ought not to surprise anybody. Almost the whole record of our government venture into shipbuilding, as a result of our entering the World War, is one of inefficiency, waste, extravagance, and, we fear, corruption, which has cost the American taxpayers billions of dollars. It is impossible to see how there could be anything else but favoritism and extravagance in the recent awards of the mail subsidies. By that we do not mean to say that our government could not conduct such a business honestly, for it has so conducted many great enterprises. Nor do we mean to condemn mail subsidies as such. But this whole development of huge mail payments was bound to go wrong because the issue was never fairly faced, and the public was systematically deceived as to what was happening and what the purpose was. Efforts to obtain outright tonnage bounties, or direct ship subsidies, have been going on for generations, and were defeated in the Administrations of Presidents Harrison and McKinley, and at later dates. But after the war, when we had a huge fleet to utilize or to get rid of, it was discovered that there was another way to beat the devil around the bush, by means of the mail subsidies. These were not merely granted to lines where the need was obvious and justifiable, but were given to establish routes for which there was not the slightest economic necessity. Politics often governed—politics plus very clever propaganda methods, which are also being brought out by the Black committee, for example, the appearance of a paid agent to tell our dear, gullible friends of the Daughters of the American Revolution, in convention assembled in Washington, just why the government should aid the merchant marine.

Now when these scandals have all been aired, the problem of what to do about our merchant marine will still face Congress. The arguments for ships of our own are, first, that we must have merchant ships in case of war; second, that we must not be dependent upon foreigners for carrying our exports and imports but should pay to Americans the sums heretofore given to foreigners for ocean services; third, that establishing lines and showing the flag abroad creates trade which will in time make the lines self-supporting; fourth, that a great nation without a merchant fleet loses prestige and sometimes gets in a bad hole, as at the outbreak of the World War when freight rates rose enormously and foreigners exploited us at will; fifth, that Americans should not be denied ocean-going careers.

This situation the navy lobby readily exploits. Unless, it says, the shipyards have plenty of merchant ships to build, they cannot be relied upon to produce the necessary naval vessels. If we have vessels running over trade routes, then that at once becomes the navy's strongest argument for creating naval bases abroad and building fast cruisers to protect those routes. Obviously Congress and the country must decide whether, for any or all of the above reasons, we are to maintain ships at a loss and at the risk of much corruption. The number of times in our national history that we have actually been gouged by having no merchant marine is, of course, negligible.

The Nation does not deny the thrill of having American-flag ships on the ocean, but it has never been able to see that it was wise to maintain a great industry if that industry could not eventually stand on its own feet. It has urged various ways of freeing American shipping from certain burdens without recourse to subsidies. If subsidies are inevitable, then let them be open and aboveboard, and not be for carrying mail when mail is not carried, or is moved at the rate of four pounds for $300,000. Much as we question outright government operation in the peculiar circumstances which prevail, it would be far better to have the government spend large sums upon its own lines than to fill the coffers of the Export Steamship Corporation, for, with all respect to that company—which has built and operated some fine ships and managed them well—this policy makes for paying other people's tailors' bills, for extravagance, for waste, for inefficiency. It has, moreover, been creating very bad blood abroad, for it has added to the glut of ships upon the ocean, and has led to charges of unfair practices.

If it is desirable to run some ships for the sake of national prestige, to give employment to American seamen, or to create business that will pay us in the future, then let us do it openly and honestly.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hitlerism Is Cracking

THAT Hitler's foreign policy is deepening the European political crisis and leading the world to the verge of another war is becoming daily more apparent. But what of his domestic policy? Is he bringing to Germany the socialism that he promised for so many years? Is he really helping the depressed middle class, the small shopkeepers, skilled artisans, peasants, and other groups that make up the bulk of his following? True, he continues to say that he will do all in his power to relieve these lower-class groups. But we can measure a man only by his deeds, not by his promises. And Adolf Hitler's deeds reveal that he is working hand in glove with the great industrial and financial interests—in short, with the very big-business interests whose policies have for years been the cause of the misery and privation which brought Hitler into power.

In his newest book, "The Menace of Fascism," John Strachey asserts that "fascism is merely the militant arm of the largest property-owners. . . . This fact is obscured, however, by the composition of the fascist parties. The core of these parties always consists of two classes of people, the lower middle class and the peasants. For no one has hitherto observed a big banker or landowner fighting his own class battles for himself. These gentlemen fight, both at home and abroad, by proxy alone." It is not necessary to follow or accept Mr. Strachey's argument in support of his contention. We have in the recent developments in Germany abundant proof that the Hitler party is the "militant arm of the largest property-owners." At the start, it is true, the Nazis made a great deal of noise about "taking over" big business. On May 3 they announced that the powerful Federation of German Industries would thereafter be administered in the name of the state by a directorate consisting of two Nazis and one industrialist. Actually, of course, this gesture was meaningless. The German fascist state has done nothing to harm the interests of a single important bank or corporation, so far as the control or management of these enterprises is concerned. On the contrary, the Hitler Government has been taking orders from the bankers and industrialists. In the middle of July, for example, Hitler called a halt to the numerous state inquiries into the affairs of private corporations that were then in progress. He declared that such "scandal-mongering" would give rise to "a sense of insecurity among business men" and "seriously restrict the growth of necessary business initiative"—which is precisely the excuse put forward by American bankers in their desperate effort to suppress the Senate banking inquiry. Step by step since then Hitler has been withdrawing even the small measure of state or party control imposed upon business in the frantic period that followed his assumption of power.

The climax came late in September. Partly because of the unspeakable anti-Jewish excesses and the ceaseless saber-rattling of the Nazis, which seriously injured Germany's foreign trade, and partly because of the insistence of the radical wing of the fascist party upon state control of all industry, business in Germany was being slowly choked to death. Hitler and his lieutenants had to define their attitude toward business and finance in order to prevent a panic, which would greatly have impaired their prestige. They went into conference with the Grand Economic Council, a group of bankers, industrialists, and shipping men which Hitler has called his "consulting general staff on economic problems." We do not know what occurred at that meeting, but we do know that after the conference Hitler calmly announced that there would be no state interference with business. Hitler's surrender amounts to this: big business is to have a free hand, as it has always had, while the fascist state machinery will be used to "coordinate" the workers, that is, keep them "loyal" to the employers and the state by the use of violent methods—by suppressing their organizations and imprisoning or murdering those who dissent. Big business could ask for nothing more.

How the radical element in the National Socialist Party will accept this state of affairs remains to be seen. It is this group that has been loudly demanding state capitalism and economic planning. It is also this group that has been in the forefront of the campaign against the Jews. Thus there will be a double cause for complaint. For as a part of the new policy the Hitler Government, through Minister of Economics Schmitt, has forbidden the boycotting of department stores and other large business houses, even though they are Jewish-owned. Discrimination against the Jewish concerns, Herr Schmitt declared, "would unquestionably cause serious disturbances in the progress of economic recovery." Surely Hitler, who for more than a decade had preached the doctrine that the Jews were to blame for virtually all of Germany's ills, must find it difficult to explain to his followers why the wealthy Jew must now be protected. Nor is it likely that this latest pronouncement, even if sincere, will halt the movement which Hitler has been so active in fomenting.

Whether Hitler's submission to the industrialists, bankers, and department-store owners will be enough to save Germany's foreign trade is questionable. Indeed, the trend continues in the other direction. Something like an automatic international boycott of German goods has developed. Many American and English firms, even some of undeniably non-Jewish ownership, are refusing to buy from Germany so long as Hitler remains. France has announced that it intends to abrogate the 1927 commercial treaty with Germany because of the changed conditions. The Polish boycott of German goods has been especially harmful, so much so indeed that no less a person than Paul Joseph Goebbels, Minister of Propaganda and Enlightenment, has gone to the length of humbling himself before "the dirty Poles" at Geneva, pleading with them to do something to stop the ruinous boycott being conducted against German goods by the Polish Jews. The loss of the Soviet Union's friendship may have even more disastrous consequences, for there are many industrial establishments in Germany working exclusively on Russian orders. That the Soviet Government means business it showed the other day by expelling the German journalists in Russia and recalling its own correspondents from Germany. This was but another step toward the cessation of all business with Germany, an outcome which is beginning to appear inevitable.

Economically the masses of the German people have been delivered into the hands of big business. Politically and spiritually they are still at the mercy of Hitler and his mad subordinates. Until Hitler and his ideas are driven out, what hope can there be for the German people?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hail, Exiled Scholars!

ON October 2, with a total absence of ceremony and flourish, the new Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science began its academic year in the auditorium and classrooms of the New School for Social Research. Its faculty consists for the time being of just ten members. They are scholars of international standing who have either been dismissed or have resigned from their chairs in German universities sequent to the contemporary *Dementia teutonica.* They form the nucleus of the "University in Exile" which Alvin Johnson, director of the New School, has conceived as that institution's "obligation to express by word and act its own faith in the value of academic liberty."

Somehow there seems to us something tremendously important in the event and in this little group of pilgrims resuming their search for truth: Karl Brandt, agronomist; Gerhard Colm, statistician and expert in finance; Arthur Feiler, economist and publicist, already known to many Americans through his judicious estimate of our civilization "America Seen Through German Eyes," and his more recent, "The Russian Experiment"; Eduard Heimann, distinguished in the field of economic theory; Hermann Kantorowicz, jurisprudent; Emil Lederer, specialist in labor and social problems; Hans Speier, sociologist; E. von Hornbostel, ethnologist; Max Wertheimer, philosopher and experimental psychologist; Frieda Wunderlich, economist and sociologist.

They are, let it be hoped, but the vanguard of those who, rejected by brutal Nazi obscurantism, are the true repositories of German culture—of our common world culture—and belong to that illustrious, if limited, company who are at home in any society where intellectual freedom endures. For it is the high hope of the sponsors of this new Graduate School that financial resources may be forthcoming to extend its scope to establish here other faculties—in the natural sciences, in art and architecture, in literature. Here is a project that may well enlist the active interest of Americans who cherish what is most precious in our heritage—our traditions of freedom of speech, of press, of conscience, in short, freedom of thought. We should hail these exiled torchbearers, not with an attitude of sympathetic kindliness toward refugees from oppression, but as thrice welcome auxiliaries in our struggle to intrench verities which today nowhere on earth are irrevocably secure. Indeed, it is for this reaffirmation and exercise of our democratic faith, for this tangible expression of our adherence to the principles of Jefferson, that we should be grateful to the originators and supporters of this unique academy.

Eighty-five years ago the immigration of the "forty-eighters," fleeing from tyranny and absolutism in Germany and Austria-Hungary, brought to us a great revivification of our democratic faith, and our institutions were strengthened by the participation in our public affairs and civic life of such adopted citizens as Carl Schurz. Even more today a migration of the best minds and noblest souls from what yesterday was the German republic would be a prize that we ought eagerly to seize. It is not too much to say that their coming may stimulate in America a cultural and intellectual renaissance, and help us to write a new and perhaps glorious chapter in the American epic.

Ring Lardner

RING LARDNER, perhaps the most distinguished American satirist of our time, died on September 25 after a long illness. Last winter *The Nation* published an extended critical analysis of his work by Clifton Fadiman, and to that we refer our readers, but we cannot let his death pass without some further comment. His was a remarkably original talent, and death will undoubtedly revive the debate which seems almost inevitable in connection with a great humorist—was he or was he not a bitterly disillusioned man who hid his despair beneath the grotesqueries of his literary manner?

Those who remember Mr. Lardner's long, melancholy face, with its curious expression of blank wonder, ought not to be surprised to discover tragic undertones in his work, but there are some who maintain that the alleged bitterness beneath the humor was merely an invention of his highbrow critics. They point out that he began his career as a popular writer for the *Saturday Evening Post;* that he was not "discovered" by the illuminati until the publication, long after, of "How to Write Short Stories"; and that he never himself showed any outward disposition to accept the role of "serious" writer which the new-found admirers tried to thrust upon him. He had begun as a newspaperman with a fondness for sports, and such he remained. The very last pieces he wrote—the reviews of the radio contributed to the *New Yorker*—frankly espoused the taste of the great public.

Those who argue thus on the basis of these facts are, we think, right, at least as far as the facts themselves will carry them. Mr. Lardner certainly was not satirizing the ball player, the actor, and the pugilist to the advantage of the more cultured elements of the population. He was not, for example, a Sinclair Lewis, determined to ridicule Americans out of their crudeness. When compelled to take sides, he was, on the contrary, and like the less resolute George Ade, fundamentally on the side of the commonest sort of common man. But to say that is not to say that he was in the slightest degree sentimental or that his chief delight was not to reveal with cruel insight the meanness and the stupidity of his chosen characters. Indeed, the depth of his cynicism is revealed in just the fact that, unadmirable and unlovable as his roughnecks were, he quite obviously did not believe them worse than anyone else. The final horror of his stories lies in the fact that they nowhere imply a belief in the existence of any class of man or woman with characters or motives essentially different from those which he made it his business to reveal.

Stylistically, Mr. Lardner's greatest achievement was, of course, the invention of a language marvelously convincing, both phonetically and in its idiom, as the speech of his chosen milieu. By means of that instrument, which rendered comment unnecessary, he could put into the mouths of his characters phrase after phrase which made the reader gasp with horror at the depths of naive ignorance and naive meanness which the phrase revealed. Funny many of the stories were, but others—like, for instance, A Day with Conrad Green—became positively terrifying. Perhaps, indeed, Mr. Lardner's achievement might be summed up by saying that he made stupidity tragic.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Issues and Men

George L. Record

IF ever there was a public-spirited man in this country of ours it was George L. Record, of New Jersey, who died in Maine last week. Every time I get discouraged over the absence of sufficient men of fine character in our public life, I obtain a good deal of consolation by thinking of the many fine, unofficial persons whom I have known who have given themselves without stint or reward to the service of their fellow-citizens, their community, their country. It would take much more than this page merely to list them—for they belong to three generations. One may well question why it should be necessary to have all these public-spirited men and women at work to better conditions, and ask whether the necessity is not an indictment of our social and governmental system. Whatever the answer to that, the honor roll which I have in mind constitutes one of the glories of our national life.

Of all these men and women I can recall none more diligent, more tireless, more unceasingly laborious in behalf of the extension and improvement of our democracy than George L. Record. Just run over the things that he accomplished or sought to accomplish. Here is a partial list of them that I have taken from the *Jersey Journal*. He was the originator of the direct-nomination system and took part in the framing of innumerable laws—laws for safeguarding the ballot box, for giving rate-making power to the Public Utility Commission, for home rule. It was he who wrote the New Jersey Corrupt Practices Act for which Woodrow Wilson gained the credit. His fight for equal taxation, for the proper taxation of utility corporations, for the shifting of taxes from homes, buildings, and improvements, and putting it upon land alone was never ending. In some cases his success was extraordinary. Single-handed he forced utility corporations to pay their proper share of the taxes, and stripped them of special favors. Untold millions of dollars have been saved to his State by the success of his battle to bestow the rate-making power upon the Public Utility Commission. All alone he started the war which resulted in the repeal of the railroad tax act, which for half a century had bestowed special favors upon the railroads. He personally prevented the reelection of Senator Dryden, the insurance Senator. As Corporation Counsel of Jersey City he defied the liquor interests, as the *Jersey Journal* points out, "at a time when it cost something to defy them."

Long before woman's suffrage became popular, Record was ready to stand up and be ridiculed for saying that he favored it. He did not hesitate to let it be known that he stood for government ownership of railroads and public utilities, but he did not come to that position until he had joined the study group of well-known men and writers who met and thrashed the whole subject out at regular intervals during an entire winter. He never asked what were the odds against him, he just went ahead, as when he led the fight to smash the Carl Lentz machine in Essex County, New Jersey. But perhaps the most interesting phase of Mr. Record's life was his relationship to Woodrow Wilson. It was characteristic of him that he would never accept a reformer, or a reformer's platform, until he had satisfied himself that the man was genuine, and then he wanted to know exactly what the man stood for. That led him to challenge Woodrow Wilson to a debate when Wilson was candidate for Governor. The debate could not be arranged, but Mr. Wilson invited Record to submit any questions that he wished to have answered. Mr. Record sent in a long list, and the president of Princeton University answered him specifically and frankly. It was one of the great hits of the Wilson campaign, and as a result of it Record joined the Wilson forces. It is hardly too much to say that George Record, James Kerney, and Joseph Tumulty were almost Governor Wilson. These men counseled him, steered him, before and after his election, and helped him formulate his program. Mr. Record, indeed, drew up a very comprehensive memorandum covering Governor Wilson's whole legislative problem which the Governor allowed him to present to a conference of politicians and citizens at the Martinique Hotel in New York the day before the Governor took office. Although then ranked as an independent progressive Republican Mr. Record was only too willing to put his experience at the service of the progressive Democratic Governor.

As he grew older, Record, like many another, came to discover that there was hope in neither of the old parties. Even the La Follette campaign of 1924 did not, however, satisfy him. He clung tenaciously to certain beliefs, and he found it hard to join any movement or party which did not represent all his views. That led to his being increasingly regarded in New Jersey as a crank who could never be satisfied—a risk run by anyone who has high ideals and clings to them.

On one occasion he began a campaign for United States Senator by deliberately setting out with a tent to educate the people to accept his doctrines. With great courage, pertinacity, and determination Mr. Record set that tent up on the high-roads and by-roads and made his appeal whether his audience was large or small. Curiously enough, he was never rewarded by election to a single office; the primaries for which he did so much never netted him a single nomination—not even after he had held several appointive offices and administered them with ability and distinction. His reason appealed, his integrity and sincerity won men's respect everywhere, but he could not arouse their enthusiasm or stir them to revolt as could Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson. He appeared cold, sometimes tedious. But he was pure gold throughout. In these days of our waning faith in our historic institutions it would be well, indeed, to place a monument to him in the most conspicuous place in Trenton with the simple inscription: "A Great Citizen of New Jersey."

Oswald Garrison Villard

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Crisis in Relief

By EDITH ABBOTT

IS the New Deal finally to reach the unemployed below the margin—those who have fallen victims to the American system of poor relief? Or is there to be nothing but a continuation of the old and discredited deal, which has meant inadequate relief, malnourished children, unpaid rents and endless evictions in all our great cities, homeless and hungry families, frightened women, bitter and resentful men? Hopeful as everyone must be of increased employment to follow such constructive Roosevelt policies as the NRA, the public-works program, the civilian conservation camps, one must still anxiously inquire when the recovery is to penetrate into that shadowy land where dwell the more than fifteen million men, women, and children who make up the families on the numerous relief lists.

The Federal Emergency Relief Act of the special session of Congress is more generous in spirit, as well as in the funds provided by the federal government, than the Republican act of July, 1932. But those who believe in the principle of federal aid were startled by the statement issued by President Roosevelt when he signed the new act on May 12. This statement, probably the most reactionary pronouncement that has come from the White House since the New Deal began, urged the public "voluntarily to contribute to the pressing needs of welfare services" and indicated that federal relief should in some mysterious way "lead to the giving of generous contributions to chests and welfare organizations throughout the country." This appeal had a strangely reminiscent sound and aroused foreboding in many parts of the country. Private charity may be a desirable personal virtue; but it has certainly been accidental, spasmodic, sporadic, and almost unbelievably inadequate—particularly in the matter of unemployment relief. Just why this note should have been sounded when it was hoped the federal government was about to initiate a bold, vigorous, and constructive policy in relief as in political and economic affairs is not easy to understand.

But the moral of the President's appeal in May was that the first obligation in the matter of relief of the unemployed lay on the "localities," by which he apparently meant townships or counties, for he went on to describe the second line of defense as the State, and then came to the federal government as the third line, only to be used in case each locality had "done its utmost." And he further developed this theory in his August message to Governor Lehman on the subject of local responsibility.

The present Federal Emergency Relief Act, which was so long under consideration both by the expiring Republican and the new Democratic Congress, is a brief statute that carefully evades the old unsolved and unsolvable problem of local relief and passes it on to the new relief administrator to struggle with, single-handed. The act clearly recognizes the need of relief as a national problem. In the preamble it solemnly announces "a serious emergency, due to widespread unemployment and increasing inadequacy of State and local relief funds"; and further declares that "the existing or threatened deprivation . . . of the necessities of life" has made it "imperative that the federal government cooperate more effectively" with the several States in "furnishing relief to their needy and distressed people." The new fund of half a billion dollars, which of course is a small amount as reconstruction sums go, is divided into two parts, the first half to be granted on a matching basis—three State or local-government dollars being required to match one dollar of federal money—the second half to be used for free grants o the States when it appears that the "combined moneys" of federal, State, and minor local governments "will fall below the estimated needs within the State." The act gives very great power to the relief executive, whose decision "as to the purpose of any expenditure shall be final." The President's appointment, therefore, of an experienced social worker of national reputation, Harry L. Hopkins of New York, as the new Federal Emergency Relief Administrator was most cordially received and awakened hopes of new relief policies in line with modern social-welfare thinking.

Some progressive steps came very promptly from the new organization. Relief funds are not to be used to subsidize the underpaid workers of substandard employers. Relief stations are not to be "cut-rate employment agencies where workers can be obtained at less than a self-supporting wage." The Federal Relief Administration will "not be a party to such attempts to take advantage of human distress." Here is the New Deal in all its fine courage and imagination! Mr. Hopkins explained that the administration "does not propose to subsidize a lot of miserable low wages around the United States or to starve people slowly with federal money and call it relief. It will not lend itself to pushing further down than they are the living standards of any community." A national system of providing care for transients has been planned, with an able woman, Dr. Ellen C. Potter of the New Jersey Welfare Department, in charge.

The new administrator has also been deservedly commended for his order that federal public funds must be expended by public relief agencies. But does this go far enough? It should put an end to the expenditure of public funds by private sectarian relief societies *when the public funds are federal funds.* But if local funds are to be used, those local public funds may be spent in the same old way.

Here, really, is the crux of the whole vexatious problem. Local relief inevitably means varying local standards of relief. Can the numerous incompetent township trustees and county supervisors who are still administering relief on the principles of an outworn poor-law system be brought up to modern standards by any plan that requires a large expenditure of local funds? No matter how many excellent new rules are announced, can they ever be carried out if thousands of the old "poormasters," "overseers of the poor," "county agents," "township trustees," and various local relief officials are to be allowed to continue their wasteful activities? The game of "pull and haul" between the federal and local relief authorities has inevitably been in full swing again during the past summer. Governors and State relief administrators seem to be advised less about the proper meth-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ods of care for underfed children and destitute men and women than about how to raise what someone in Washington thinks can still be wrung out of the local taxpayers in order to protect those who are, or should be, federal income-tax payers. The same old policy of anxious uncertainty still continues—federal grants that will last only a short time, leaving those in charge of providing the necessities of life for the unemployed to wonder where the funds for the next "warrant day" or the next relief-work pay day will be found. In the meantime, will the administrator let the people with empty cupboards wait while the State relief administrators implore the various State legislatures to provide new sources of relief funds, while governors disagree with mayors, and county supervisors disagree with both? The reported answer of the federal administrator to this question is that "the unemployed are going to take an awful beating this winter" unless the federal government's half-billion of relief is matched by minor public authorities.

The Federal Relief Administrator has been struggling with the States whose representatives have been begging for help from the "free money"—the second $250,000,000 provided in the law. Various governors have been told that money must be raised to obtain grants from the first $250,000,000 on the "three-to-one" matching basis before grants from the second fund would be made. The administrator announced, for example, that "apparently a few States did not believe the President" when he pointed out "that it is essential for States and local units of government to finance a reasonable share of their emergency-relief work." He went even farther: "Some States," he said, "are due for a rude shock in the very near future if they do not come through with action." It was announced that "the Federal Emergency Relief Administration means business," and does not intend "to struggle along with these situations." Are such "warnings" issued by an administrator who understands the problems of destitution and knows that the families of the unemployed will pay the costs of such a policy?

While the Federal Emergency Relief Administration has been busy trying to make this governor and the other one understand that relief grants can be made "only on a matching basis," the law remains clear that half the fund may be used for unmatched grants if the administrator thinks that local money cannot reasonably be expected. It is important to note also that the law specifically states that after October 1, 1933, notwithstanding the "three-to-one" matching provision, the unexpended balance of the three-to-one half of the fund may "in the discretion of the administrator and with the approval of the President" be made available for free grants. It is hard to believe that the President can wish to perpetuate the old theory of local government which makes the small property-tax payer responsible for the relief that his poorer neighbors need. This outgrown theory of local taxation has been condemned root and branch by political scientists and economists as well as by social workers.

Kentucky was one of the first States to feel the shock which the administrator is reported to have "promised to all States and local units which did not assume their proper share of relief burdens." The ruder shock and still ruder awakening will be felt, of course, by the families of the unemployed rather than by the Governor; but these unhappy people are unfortunately used to it. The Governor of Kentucky was notified that Kentucky must provide for its own, at least on a three-to-one basis. According to the press reports, the federal administrator, writing to Governor Laffoon in July, said that he wished to make it "perfectly clear" that the Federal Relief Administration would not finance relief work in Kentucky beyond the middle of last August. What then? The administrator's advice was that in view of the "difficult financial situation in many counties and cities" it seemed "imperative that a special session of the legislature be called at once to provide substantial funds," so that Kentucky would pay a reasonable share of the cost of caring for its own destitute. But, after all, are not these the nation's destitute, the victims of a great national catastrophe with which the President is trying to deal on a national scale?

According to further press accounts, the request of Governor White of Ohio "for $4,000,000 pending further efforts by the State to care for the destitute" was also refused. "They need the money, no question about that," the administrator is reported to have said. "The only question is, Who is to put it up?" The administrator is further quoted as saying that Ohio had already received $3,214,569 from the three-to-one half of the new federal fund and that the Ohio legislature had adjourned without making "adequate provision to raise a fair share of relief costs." The federal administrator's letter to the Governor of Ohio recalled his "previous warning" that he could not make grants to Ohio other than on a matching basis. "If this additional grant were made, the federal govrnment would be meeting three-fourths of all expenditures on behalf of the unemployed within your State. This," the administrator wrote, "it seems to me, is an unreasonable share to ask the federal government to carry."

Can President Roosevelt possibly approve the two very unfortunate results that must inevitably follow this attempt to compel the incompetent, bankrupt local authorities to provide more relief funds? The first result is that sales taxes of one kind or another have been resorted to—are, in fact, still being resorted to—in all parts of the country to pay the local relief bills. State sales taxes have the merit of saving the federal income-tax payers—but have they any other merit? The second unfortunate result is that the other important social services are being cut to the bone and beyond. The school systems are being destroyed: school terms have been shortened; vacation schools closed everywhere, evening schools given up, social services in the schools discarded, kindergartens and recreation centers closed. The State welfare programs are being cut down, child-guidance clinics are being given up or curtailed, greatly needed hospitals that were planned and approved are not being built, county welfare units are being derailed. Yet relief is still cruelly inadequate. The fifth winter of destitution is at hand. People are broken. Are these sacrifices to be their share of the New Deal?

A story is told of a Russian peasant in the famine area who said to an inquiring visitor, "Yes, there is less bread in Russia since the revolution, but there is more hope." The New Deal undoubtedly wishes to rekindle a little hope among those who have lost this cherished possession along with all their worldly goods, but this can never be done through the present local relief authorities. Recently issued federal statistics show that there are still fifteen million men, women, and children living on relief, looking into a desperate present and an impenetrable future. Disciplining local

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

authorities is certainly a very slow and doubtful method of helping these unhappy people. The underlying truth in the whole wretched relief business is that the New Deal has been persuaded to try to keep alive a thoroughly antiquated pauper-relief system that belongs to the days of the ox cart and the stagecoach. Local government, local taxes, local poor relief had some significance in pioneer days—and so did slavery, squatter sovereignty, free soil, and the controversy over the "subjection of women"—but they have no relation to the facts of modern life. What we need is a thorough statutory housecleaning—the abolition of the old poor laws from the statute books of all the States, the throwing overboard of the old principles of settlement and local relief that belong to a dim and very ancient past. Will not the New Deal give us a new method of public assistance that will bring together the necessary regulatory statutes in a modern system of social welfare, a new Public Assistance Code, under federal control, supported by the federal government?

Recovery Hits a Bad Week

By PAUL Y. ANDERSON

Washington, September 30

THE Administration has just gone through the worst week since the recovery program was launched. The enforced absence of General Johnson from NRA headquarters, because of a minor operation, retarded progress and resulted in considerable backbiting among his subordinates. Production in the capital-goods industries continues to lag, although I note that Roosevelt—who seems to think of everything—is taking steps to have the government finance the purchase of a large amount of railroad equipment. The National Labor Board has been slow in settling labor disputes, and its tardiness has invited criticism and encouraged more strikes. Incidentally, it would appear on the strength of the record to date that I dealt harshly with Grover Whalen in this place recently. I should not like to answer for the actions of such a man a week hence, but the fact remains that up to now his decisions have been prompt and uniformly fair to labor. As long as Sidney Hillman is satisfied, I shall not complain. At the same time it is obvious that in the codes thus far approved, the maximum hours of labor have been too long, and the minimum wages too small, to produce a substantial increase in purchasing power or an adequate decrease in unemployment. Johnson and Richberg have been entirely too "reasonable" with the industrial magnates. On top of this is the spectacle of wholesale cheating and chiseling by employers who have signed codes or reemployment agreements. Before long, I am convinced, Johnson will be compelled to lead some important industrialist out to the middle of the stage and publicly chop off his head. Otherwise, disregard of the codes and agreements will become universal, and the whole program will collapse. In sum, almost everything is wrong with the NRA except the things most commonly mentioned by its critics.

* * * * *

IT would be an act of poetic justice if the severest members of the critical tribe could be herded into a common hall, and there, without having their knives taken away from them, ordered to agree on a program of national recovery. What a group that would be! Among others it would include the Mellons, the Communists, Henry Ford, some of the editors of *The Nation* and the *New Republic,* the Chicago *Tribune,* the *Daily Worker,* the New York *Herald Tribune,* Norman Thomas, the Alabama soft-coal operators, and the directors of the American Iron and Steel Institute. I hazard the guess that no program would ever emerge and that the survivors would be few in number. Permit me, in passing, to correct a serious inaccuracy which appeared in the editorial comment in *The Nation* of September 20. The editors apparently were under the impression that the Blue Eagle is only displayed by employers who subscribe to the President's temporary reemployment agreement. The fact is that the Blue Eagle is intended to be used—and is being used—not only by signers of the temporary agreement but also by employers operating under permanent codes. In order to obtain it, the employer, either in person or through his trade association, must sign a code or agreement. Therefore the question of whether Henry Ford publicly subscribes to the recovery program by signing on the dotted line is a very important one. The truth about Ford's refusal is simple enough and well known. He is determined to take no step that might encourage his employees to organize. Unionization of the Ford plants would mean the quick and certain elimination of scores of tricky rules through which Ford workers are chiseled out of time and money. It was Ford who invented the practice—subsequently adopted by many manufacturers—of discharging his more highly paid workmen and then reemploying them in lower-salaried categories. This writer will shed few tears if the tyrant of Highland Park exercises his constitutional right to retire from the business of making automobiles.

* * * * *

IT is gratifying to report that the hearings on a code for newspapers resulted in a complete rout of the publishers at every point. Seldom if ever has any industry cut such an ignominious figure at a public hearing. This resulted from a variety of factors. In the first place, the publishers' representatives committed almost every tactical blunder conceivable. The main presentation in their behalf was made by Elisha Hanson, a pompous little Washington lawyer whose chief claim to fame rests on his success in obtaining tax refunds during the Mellon regime and the fact that his firm was retained to lobby against the proposed Senate investigation of the power trust. He hauled off by stating that newspapers are especially protected by the Constitution, that they did not have to go under a code unless they wished to, and that they would only come in on their own terms. Then, by implication, he threatened the Recovery Administration with court injunctions and unfavorable publicity unless the publishers' demands were met. Finally, he insisted on an open-shop clause, refused to abolish child labor, and declined to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

offer any provisions for the elimination of unfair methods of competition. The deputy administrator who conducted the hearing was Dr. Lindsay Rogers, a brilliant and hard-boiled young Columbia University professor, and just about the last person in Washington upon whom Hanson should have tried such tactics. Moreover, it was patent that the publishers had completely underestimated the volume and force of the opposition to their so-called "code." They were badly shaken when a succession of first-rank social workers, led by Miss Grace Abbott, accused them of being the only employers in the country who insisted on perpetuating child labor, and produced a mass of statistics showing the high rate of delinquency and disease among newsboys. Next came a string of reporters, representing organizations of editorial employees in a dozen cities, who spilled more facts in an hour than Hanson and his clients had admitted in half a day. Finally came the representatives of the newspaper mechanical trades, who literally took the hide off the publishers. They had all the figures on wages and unemployment, and they didn't mince words. Not since Miss Frances Perkins addressed herself to the steel magnates have any employers listened to such a savage castigation as that which the publishers heard from the lips of Charlie Howard, president of the Typographical Union.

* * * * *

NOBODY should be surprised to learn that the code for the aluminum industry submitted by Uncle Andy Mellon's none-too-bright boys was one of the worst yet received at the NRA. The minimum wages for adult workers were the lowest proposed by any industry, and actually would constitute a reduction from the existing scale. Winthrop C. Neilson, vice-president of the Aluminum Company of America and one of the most naive industrialists who have appeared in Washington recently, told Deputy Administrator Kemp that the company had been paying a scale of twenty-two cents an hour to workers in its Arkansas bauxite mines, and had raised the figure to thirty cents under a temporary reemployment agreement for the sole purpose of getting the Blue Eagle, but desired to make it twenty-five cents under the permanent code. He dwelt at length upon the benevolent paternalism of the company toward its employees, mentioning among other things that it supplies them with free drinking water. Sanitary conditions in company houses, he went on, probably are not excelled anywhere. When Kemp asked him what plumbing they contained, he replied, "None." The Mellon company operates factories where aluminum bronze powder is made. It is highly explosive, and is responsible for various types of infection. During the hearing it was disclosed that girls are employed in these factories at sixty-three cents a day. Perhaps the only relieving moment of the proceeding occurred when George D. Haskell, an independent fabricator of aluminum products, chose for discussion a singularly atrocious clause in the Mellon code, and said: "There seems to be considerable doubt about the parentage of this clause. Well, that's the kind of a clause it is." All of which, it seems to me, should tend to demonstrate why decent people should stick together in the present crisis, instead of involving themselves in futile controversies over methods of procedure. If it is true that "boycott" is an ugly word, it is also true that privation, malnutrition, disease, and starvation are equally ugly facts.

Russia: Fear and Foreign Policy

By LOUIS FISCHER

Moscow, September 13

EVERY intellectual and Communist in Europe has either used or heard the argument that the Soviet government should have adopted a more hostile attitude toward the Hitler regime. When all the world condemned the Nazi persecutions of Jews, the Soviet press printed the facts without comment. When thousands of German Communists were being arrested, tortured, and killed, the Russian Communists refrained from any public protest, and normal relations between Berlin and the Kremlin continued undisturbed. Indeed, the Soviets allowed Hitler to renew the 1926 Berlin non-aggression treaty, a move that irritated many radicals and supplied the Trotzkyists with welcome ammunition.

In August the Nazis, true to their medieval atavism, executed four old and tried workingmen-Communists in Altona by beheading them with an ax. No Komsomols marched through the streets of Moscow or any other Soviet city. The Soviet press did not raise a single cry against the outrage. The *Izvestia* incautiously reprinted the protests of French bourgeois papers, but was silent itself, and its readers might well have asked: "Why do the capitalists remonstrate against the murder of Communists while we Communists hold our tongue. Why?"

I could give other instances of Soviet propriety and restraint in the face of uninterrupted Nazi provocation. Hitler and Hindenburg, the heads of the German government, openly contributed to a public relief fund for German colonists who, allegedly, were starving on the Volga. They knew that the money would never be admitted into Russia. They knew that this was only a demonstration of hostility which the U. S. S. R. would resent. Yet they did it. Moscow, nevertheless, avoids any act or sign of sympathy with the victims of German terrorism. The Soviet government, perhaps, must remain neutral and correct, even though Chancellor Hitler, Nazi ministers, and official government newspapers attack the Soviet Union every day. But why cannot the Communist Party, the unofficial *Pravda,* and numerous unofficial Russian organizations—Soviet authors, for instance—express their abhorrence of German cruelties? Why does not Maxim Gorki join Romain Rolland, Professor Einstein, and others in arousing world public opinion on the Reichstag-fire issue? The reason is in no sense a guilty Soviet conscience. Of course the Bolsheviks had their red terror. In the first place, however, the red terror was never personally vindictive and needlessly cruel as the Nazi terror has been. The red terror began about eight months after the revolution, when the Soviets were attacked by foreign and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

internal enemies who seriously threatened their existence. It was never directed against any race. It was not a sop to deluded followers who, if they did not get blood, might demand the fulfilment of promises. The Bolsheviks, moreover, have always objected to capitalist class justice though they have admitted practicing class justice themselves. Then how explain their passive attitude toward Nazi atrocities?

I have put the case to many Russians without receiving a satisfactory reply. They tell me that mere words and parades are meaningless, and that Hitler will only yield to real pressure of the kind that German Communists are now applying. But did not Russians demand the release of Mooney, Sacco and Vanzetti, the Scottsboro boys, and Hungarian and Rumanian Communists? They tell me that if they should cut their foreign political ties with Germany, Paris would feel that Russia has no alternative to a pro-French policy and would, accordingly, be ready to pay less for Soviet friendship. This is ridiculous. No Power's value is enhanced by swallowing insults. They tell me many things which reveal either ignorance of the true reply or a desire to conceal it. I know that while liberals and radicals the world over are sincerely distressed by Nazi persecutions, many countries which appear to be horrified might not find their own hands lily-white. A Poland protesting against anti-Jewish persecutions is a comic anomaly. Other states have ground down national minorities and disaffected colonial peoples no less ruthlessly than has the Germany of the hooked cross. The white terror in China is probably as shocking as the brown terror in Germany. Yet popular movements do not thunder against Chiang Kai-shek. Much of the emotion in Western lands against Hitler is a carefully nursed preparation for government moves should German rearmament warrant forcible Allied intervention. Much anti-Nazi propaganda is at bottom anti-German and smacks of war-time psychology and of hypocrisy. None of these considerations, however, excuses the Bolsheviks.

Several Bolsheviks have said to me: "We are not ready." I have read into this reply a sentiment which I know has long determined Soviet foreign policy—the fear of war. This is the reason why Soviet public opinion, which could easily have been mobilized against the Nazis, was stifled, and why Communists who wanted to organize public protests were checked. It is superfluous to say that the Bolsheviks and most Soviet citizens are supremely pained and incensed by the German terror. Their silence is tactical. It reflects a feverish apprehension in the Kremlin lest Germany join Japan to fight the Soviet Union.

One gets nowhere by submitting to Bolsheviks that Germany would have to overrun Poland in order to invade Russia, and that France would not allow a German military advance. Some Communists do not exclude the possibility of a German-Polish bloc against Russia. Vice-Chancellor von Papen, ex-Minister Hugenberg, and Alfred Rosenberg, Hitler's Baltic foreign-political mentor who already has an active anti-Bolshevik past, have all urged a partitioning of southern Russia from which Poland and Germany could both obtain ample territorial compensation. Official Nazi organs frankly discuss the possibility of tearing away large regions from the main body of the Soviet Union. The Ukraine interested Germany before and during the World War, and the Hitler movement has made no effort to conceal its designs on that rich Soviet republic.

Stalin undoubtedly would be less concerned with these Nazi ambitions were it not for the simultaneous threat in the Far East. And were it not for conditions at home. The Soviet transport system is badly run down. It is the weakest link in the Russian economic chain, and its rapid reorganization and reconstruction will probably require foreign assistance. More important was the food shortage in large sections of the country during last winter and spring. Altogether apart from Moscow's constitutional and traditional disinclination to interrupt material progress by military activities, these domestic factors were a powerful argument for peace, for they would have undermined Russia's strength in case of war. To gain time, and at the risk of inviting foreign Communist and foreign radical displeasure, the Kremlin marked time, the Kremlin suppressed its natural reactions, and the Kremlin made concessions. (Moscow would have yielded on the question of the British engineers had not the arrogant behavior of Sir Esmond Ovey, the British Ambassador, closed the door to a settlement without a trial.)

One of these concessions is the offer to sell the Chinese Eastern Railway. The decision, apparently, was sudden and based on a panicky fear of what the Japanese might do and what the Soviets could not do. The road, to be sure, lost its strategic significance for Russia when the Japanese occupied Northern Manchuria. Its military and economic value to the U. S. S. R. is further diminished by lines which Japan is hastily constructing in Manchuria in the direction of the Siberian frontier. The C. E. R., therefore, is not worth fighting for, and would do the Soviets little good in case of a fight. Nor do the Bolsheviks need to consider China's sensibilities: Chiang Kai-shek has either already arrived at a general agreement with Tokio or is about to do so, and for the Russians to antagonize Japan in order to defend Chinese rights when the Chinese themselves are not ready to defend them would be quixotic. Despite these justifications of the sale of the C. E. R., however, the offer to sell was unnecessary and unwise because it implied official Soviet recognition of the Japanese annexation of Manchuria, which is the well-known revolver pointed at the temple of Siberia.

Soviet counsels were always divided about the surrender of the Chinese Eastern. Lenin wished to present it to China in 1919, but certain powerful Bolshevik leaders objected. Russia was inclined to give it to China in 1924, but Dr. Sun Yat-sen objected. Red military have claimed that without the C. E. R. Vladivostok and the Maritime Provinces become untenable. They are equally so, however, as long as the Japanese are in Northern Manchuria, and the fact is that the Japanese position on the other side of the Siberian boundary forces Moscow to maintain mighty land and air armaments in the Pacific area. This is expensive. But the sale of the C. E. R. will change nothing. It will not appease aggressive Japanese generals who feel that the road is theirs anyway, or theirs to seize some day, and whose ambitions go far beyond the legal title to the C. E. R. The sale was calculated to satisfy Japanese appetites for a while and give the U. S. S. R. another breathing space till better times arrived. That was Lenin's policy at Brest-Litovsk. Japan, it was argued here, could not start a war in the midst of the negotiations about the purchase of the line. The Russians could thus buy another year of peace. But it seems that the Japanese military were not ready to attack Russia, anyway, and Moscow's nervousness was therefore unfortunate. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russians must determine their foreign policy with less subjectiveness and with a better understanding of foreign conditions.

A Bolshevik would argue that the U. S. S. R. lost nothing by its meek policy toward Germany and its conciliatory attitude toward Japan. I would reply that it gained nothing. Moreover, since the dread of German and Japanese attacks was exaggerated, it probably lost in the eyes of foreign Powers, foreign Communists, and its own citizens.

Today, despite unfavorable weather—thanks, therefore, to Bolshevik methods—the Soviet Union has an excellent harvest. This has already had a noticeable effect on the spirit of the population and may soon influence foreign policy as well. The German government is transferring Dr. von Dirksen from its Moscow embassy to Tokio and replacing him with Nadolny. Moscow has been Nadolny's goal for many years, and his championship of good Soviet-German relations was the reason that Hitler appointed him to the Russian capital. But I believe the move will fail. The Soviet government's pacts with France and Poland, and Litvinov's aggression-defining conventions, were the careful, well-planned Soviet preparation for paying Germany back in her own coin.

Hitler has abandoned, in fact if not formally, the Rapallo tradition of friendship with Russia, and now that Soviet internal economic conditions have radically improved, Moscow may be expected to play a firm card against the Wilhelmstrasse. International politics is a queer game: the conclusion of the Soviet non-aggression pact with Fascist Italy early this month was made the occasion for a determined and gratuitous verbal attack on Fascist Germany. It is too soon for a changed attitude in the Far East. But unless the Tokio Foreign Office can bring its military into line, the haggling over the selling price of the Chinese Eastern may never reach a satisfactory end, and Japan's generals may then see fit to seize the railroad—a development which, in my opinion, would not be wholly regrettable.

The obvious fact that the same psychology actuated Moscow's weak policy toward Japan and toward Germany indicates that the Russian attitude to Nazi cruelties was the result of fear of war at an inopportune moment rather than of indifference. In the Manchurian situation only Russia's national interests were involved and not the Kremlin's views on world revolution. Yet Moscow took the same peace-at-any-price stand in the Far East as in Germany. A single phenomenon may, of course, be induced by two different stimuli, but in this case the burden of evidence favors the conclusion that the cause was one and the same.

Having said this, I must not omit to add that Moscow's relation to world revolutionary and world counter-revolutionary developments has undergone a change. Moscow's most revolutionary mood of recent years found expression in Borodin's activities in China in 1925-26 and in Russian support of the British mining and general strikes in 1926. Yet at that stage Soviet domestic economic policies were almost reactionary: in 1925 the rich kulak peasants received new privileges from the state. In 1930 the Five-Year Plan and collectivization were under way. The Bolsheviks' energies were absorbed at home, and at that time, in my book "The Soviets in World Affairs," I suggested the formula: "More revolutionary policy at home marches hand in hand with greater indifference to developments abroad." In Marxist terminology this would read: "If you intensify the class war at home by industrialization and collectivization, you must be all the more zealous in avoiding complications abroad." The worst after-effects of the class warfare of the era of the Five-Year Plan were evident in the first part of 1933. That was the semester of Nazi barbarity, and the period in which Moscow offered to sell the Chinese Eastern. Moscow's hand were tied. The worst after-effects are now gone. A marked improvement has set in. The industrial and military potency of the U. S. S. R. grows every day as the result of expanded production in scores of new giant plants. In eastern Siberia the Soviets have a fine army of unmatched morale and an air fleet of great efficiency. Time is a factor playing into the hands of the Bolsheviks, and every passing week brings to the red forces new and more modern mechanical equipment. The Soviet Union's foreign position has also been tremendously strengthened by the rapprochement with France and Poland. Herriot's trip was not without significance for Germany. Berlin and Tokio may soon feel the difference.

The difference, however, may disappoint some zealots. For the Soviet government will continue its present policy of scrupulously refraining from participation in foreign Communist activities. Only the politically illiterate will fail to understand that a revolutionary state cannot behave like a revolutionary party striving for power. It may the business of foreign Communists, for instance, to organize a strike in a factory in Germany or Czecho-Slovakia, but if that factory is filling a Soviet order for machinery which Magnitogorsk needs for its completion, the tactics of the Communists will be to postpone the strike. Longshoremen in Denmark, Spain, and other countries are refusing to unload Nazi steamers. But if a Nazi steamer brings electric turbines to Leningrad, it is the duty of the Leningrad proletariat to unload them. By boycotting the Hakenkreuz ship they would damage the Soviet state, while the Danish and Spanish workers only hurt their capitalist bosses (and also Germany, of course).

Russia's economic relations with Germany help the Nazis. But those relations are maintained because they help the Bolsheviks. This ought to be clear to anyone who knows his political A B C. Soviet orders help capitalists to solve their problems. But those orders are given so that Russia may solve her problems. The Kremlin's first concern is the progress of the revolution. This task may demand compromises. But to conclude that the Bolsheviks have become counter-revolutionaries is the height of folly. The biggest contribution the Russian Communists can make to the cause of world revolution is the success of Soviet economy, and no one can declare that they have not done a very great deal in this respect. Not even Trotzky in his most irresponsible moments has asserted that the Soviet government is counter-revolutionary. Soviet domestic policy is more revolutionary today than it was at any time between 1917 and 1929. Foreign critics must keep these things in mind. A little thought will suppress a lot of wild emotion. The triumph of agrarian collectivization in the U. S. S. R. is far more important for the world revolution than making faces at Hitler or calling him names. There ought to be a division of labor: those condemned to sterile anger in bourgeois countries can stick to the faces and names, while the Bolsheviks continue on their difficult climb toward a socialist state.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Trained Nurse and the Depression

By CAROLYN CONANT VAN BLARCOM

TO some nurses the depression has brought utter heartbreaking devastation; to others, one of the best lessons ever given to a group or an individual. The explanation of these widely differing effects is to be found in the individual nurse's reasons for studying nursing, the character of her personal equipment, and the place filled by her work in the whole pattern of her life. The profession as a group cherishes a fine ideal of what a nurse should be, but as long as nurses are recruited from the rank and file of human beings there will be many who depart widely from this ideal.

The nurse as she is commonly visualized today is a normal, conscientious, intelligent young woman who needs or wants an occupation. An enormous variety of opportunities is open to such a young woman. That from them all she chooses nursing is very largely due to her innate maternalism, although she may not herself recognize this influence. The instinct is there, and the prospect of relieving and protecting those who are suffering and need her help is the lure that draws many young women to hospital doors. Unquestionably a goodly number take up nursing for more obvious reasons. The training is an inexpensive preparation for earning a living; it may offer the only opportunity to get away from an uncongenial home; it may seem to offer a round of romantic possibilities; it may be the first step in a well-thought-out plan for a life of service; or it may be regarded as valuable preparation for meeting the general demands of life.

Whatever is back of her choice, the average young woman who enters the nursing profession is markedly improved by the experience. She grows more tender, more generous, and more understanding as her contact with human suffering widens. It becomes second nature to her to shoulder the burdens of others. She often contributes a generous part of her earnings toward the support of those less fortunate than herself—helps to pay off the mortgage on the home, educates younger brothers and sisters, gives gratuitous care to sick friends and relatives, and far more frequently than is generally realized, further impoverishes herself by relieving needy patients in the course of her rounds.

But in spite of her selfless concern for those to whom she brings care and solace, such a nurse is still a normal, thinking, feeling woman whose own life goes on. And this life of her own is likely to be pitifully starved, lived as it is on the fringe of other people's lives, never quite belonging to herself, and united only by their misfortune to those other lives about her. The normal, thinking, feeling woman could not continue to be normal for very long if her emotional life consisted solely of suffering with other people. A nurse's poise, strength, and efficiency survive because of a certain sense of security and certain compensations in her own inner life. One is the intense gratification she derives from being able, through her earnings, to enrich the lives of those to whom she gives her protecting affection. Another is represented by a room or small apartment where her own possessions are always waiting to surround her with an intimate and very precious sense of home. There are, of course, other forms of compensation. But the sustained satisfaction of her maternalism, vicarious though it be, which she gets from providing protection and opportunity for those she loves, and of her domesticity, from the possession of even a tiny home of her own, has a steadying, restful effect. Tranquillity in her own inner life greatly increases her capacity for work.

The effect of unemployment upon a nurse of the caliber I have just described—whether engaged in private duty, hospital, or public-health work—has been almost devastating. The satisfaction of enriching the lives of those she loves has been replaced by haunting anxiety for their welfare and the fear that she may even become a burden upon them. This and the loss of her own restful sanctuary, with all that that implies, frequently render her utterly unfit to give satisfactory service to those who need her care and can pay for it. It is quite true that other self-supporting women give help to their families and have suffered acutely when forced to stop, and have been deeply scarred by the loss of their own room or apartment. But through the inevitable association of the nurse's inner life with her professional duties, unemployment has seemed to result in a more serious psychological wound for her than for women of most other groups. Intangible though this injury may be, it is one of the serious consequences of the depression.

Very frequently a previously valuable nurse has had to be withdrawn from employment, lack of which was destroying her, because the pressure of her own anxieties, together with the removal of the factors that preserved her mental health, made her unbearably depressing and irritating to her patients. I may seem to give undue attention to this intangible aspect of the problem of the nurse and the depression. But its significance has become increasingly apparent to those in touch with nurses either through the registries or the emergency-relief organizations. Calls from doctors have more and more frequently specified a nurse who was "not nervous." Persons administering unemployment relief have found the situation of the nurse complicated by her frenzy over her dependents and by a curious instability that seemed traceable to the loss of her room or apartment. For example, one nurse proved repeatedly to be unfit for either private duty or average hospital work because of uncharacteristic excitability. She was finally given work in a small hospital where only slender demands were made upon her capacity for adjustment, her salary of $12 a week being paid by an emergency-relief committee. This small sum enabled her to nestle into a little room of her own to which she could retreat when her hospital day was over. The effect upon her harassed soul was so tranquillizing that in the course of a few weeks she was normal enough to give entirely satisfactory care to a patient whose doctor asked for a nurse who was "not nervous." Unhappily only too few have been able to obtain such understanding relief.

No one who knows anything about the nursing profes-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sion believes that it is made up entirely of the selfless, maternal women who have suffered in this delicate, intricate way from the financial crash. Another type, seen all too frequently, has suffered deeply though less subtly. This is the impersonal, mediocre woman who has taken up nursing solely as a means of livelihood. Her background may be such that the nurse's fees look like a large sum of money easily earned.

During our prosperous years, when people in general grew more and more self-indulgent and luxurious, trained nurses were called in on the slightest pretext or on no pretext at all. Often there were not enough nurses to meet the demand. Any nurse who wanted work could get it, and more than that, she could specify the kind of case she would or would not take. She gave her patients as little service as she dared and often made unreasonable, even preposterous demands upon the patient's household. I remember one very ill woman living alone in an apartment whose doctor decided one day that she would have to have a nurse. The dismayed patient actually moaned and said, "Oh, doctor, don't! I don't feel well enough to wait on her." That may sound amusing but it exemplifies a situation that has made conscientious nurses sick at heart. The ease with which nurses got work during the flush period gave the unscrupulous type an undue sense of security and importance. She developed inappropriate habits of personal extravagance and spent money faster than she made it. The depression found her already in financial difficulties. All nurses have suffered as a result of the resentment which the poor service given by this type has stirred up among the lay public. Now that money is scarce, people think a good many times twice before employing someone they may have to "wait on." They have got into the habit of having colds and attacks of nerves unattended by crisp white uniforms and equally crisp manners. When a nurse is called in now, she has to give service that is uniformly better than it was some time ago, or run the risk of being speedily replaced by someone else from the long registry list. Inefficient nurses will be improved by the depression. They have had a sharp lesson from which they and their patients will benefit in the future.

A great many nurses, thrifty and improvident alike, have suffered acutely from having to seek shelter in cheap rooming-houses where for the first time they have met repugnant affronts and overtures. And in their desperation they have drifted around among agencies which they would not ordinarily visit. Responding to a call for a secretary, companion, or even a nurse, they have found that the call took them to a club or hotel room where the service asked for was only a blind.

One factor that has made the depression particularly serious among nurses was operating before the crash came. There were too many nurses. Leaders in the nursing profession and others interested in its welfare sounded a warning long ago. The trouble started back in the days of unhealthy prosperity. As wealth increased and luxurious habits kept pace, hospitals multiplied rapidly. The cheapest, though not the best, way of getting hospital work done is by means of the apprentice system of training nurses. Accordingly, self-styled schools of nursing came into being within the hospitals. Often the entrance requirements of these schools left much to be desired as to the personality, education, intelligence, and purpose of the students. It was apparent to many that the great output of graduates from these alleged schools was working havoc in the profession and hardship among patients, and the leading educators of the profession felt great anxiety about the outcome.

It must be stated clearly that not all the graduates from this mushroom growth of schools were poor nurses. But in general, the majority of the graduates from the small, suddenly developed hospital never should have entered any school for nurses and certainly not the diploma mills by which they were exploited. The production of too many and too poor nurses that went on long before the depression made bad matters worse when the crash came. Unemployment was already causing anxiety. When the financial bottom dropped out, the nursing profession was already in trouble.

As a whole, the profession is facing its problem with characteristic courage and altruism. It is trying to relieve the immediate needs of its members and to make adjustments that will result in increased stability and improved standards. In order to relieve immediate needs, many nurses who are able to eke out a living without nursing have retired from the field so as to leave more work for those who have nothing to fall back on. Many nurses have contributed their services to hospitals in financial distress. This donated service has made it possible for these hospitals to receive and treat patients who otherwise would have gone without sorely needed care. In some hospitals where the school enrolment is being cut down in order to graduate fewer nurses, the alumnae associations have pledged themselves to furnish graduate nurses, gratuitously, for regular hospital work to offset the shortage of pupil nurses on duty.

An adjustment that promises future benefits is the eight-hour day at a reduced fee for private-duty nurses, instead of the time-honored, back-breaking twelve-hour day. Under this arrangement a patient requiring special nurses would have three nurses, each working eight hours, instead of two who were on duty twelve hours each. The cost to the patient is about the same, or possibly less than for two twelve-hour nurses. And three nurses instead of two are at work, and under more humane conditions. The patient benefits by being in the care of nurses who are fresh and rested.

Taking a look ahead, I do not find the effect of the depression altogether discouraging for the profession as a whole. It is true that many individuals have been given such a cruel hurt at the very root of their being that they will scarcely recover. The tragedy here is that the sensitiveness and spirituality that made many of these women the fine nurses they were have played a part in their undoing. But the whole sickening collapse has enabled, even forced, the nursing group, the doctors, and the laity to take stock. Even now it looks as though the end were in sight for the small inadequate schools whose purpose has been to get cheap hospital workers rather than to prepare carefully selected students for serious life-work.

It seems safe to prophesy that after ten years of the forward-looking planning that has already been started, the nursing profession will have a more uniform standard and be on a higher average level than it has been in the recent past. There will be a sifting out of the nurses who go on and off duty by the clock and bulldoze patients and families alike.

[*This is the eighth of a series of articles on the economic crisis and the professions. Others will appear in subsequent issues.*]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Utah Seeks Its Own New Deal

By MURRAY E. KING

HAVE the people of Utah been lashed by the depression to the point where they are willing to experiment with democracy? This question is being asked by many liberals following an amazing popular response to a recent petition for a referendum vote in Salt Lake City on a proposed municipal power and light plant.

A group of progressives in Salt Lake City discovered recently that, hidden away in its archives and almost forgotten, Utah had an initiative and referendum law. They decided the time was at last ripe for using this instrument of democracy, public sentiment having visibly changed as a result of the hard times, which had made about one-third of the families of Salt Lake City dependent upon public aid. The sponsoring group contained such representative persons as A. C. Todd and R. H. Doelle, leaders in the struggle for public ownership; Judge Galen S. Young, a grandson of Brigham Young and an outstanding barrister; M. I. Thompson, president of the Utah State Federation of Labor and editor of its official organ, the *Utah Labor News;* Alfred Sorenson and other prominent Socialists; Guy Crane, a mining geologist who stands high in educational circles; and Robert W. Weech, a substantial business man.

Under the act, the petition calling for a referendum on the proposed measure must be signed before notaries by 10 per cent of the voters at the last previous election. The task seemed herculean; in fact, the difficulty of securing the requisite number of signatures in a conservative and unresponsive community had been the cause of the law's disuse since 1917. But the present sponsors believed that the depression and the unusual public resentment against the Utah Power and Light Company and the power trust had produced revolutionary changes in public thinking, and they therefore placed the petitions in the hands of field workers for circulation.

Not the least among the signs of change in public opinion in Utah had been the crushing defeat and retirement of Reed Smoot from the United States Senate in the 1932 election and the elevation to his place of Elbert Thomas, a university professor and a liberal. Smoot's advocacy of the power trust's proposal to tax the consumers of light and power rather than the great corporations extorting monopolistic profits had been one of the chief causes of his downfall.

The popular response transcended the expectations of the most sanguine. More than 90 per cent of the citizens approached signed the petitions. More than 10,000 voters, 4,000 more than the required 10 per cent, signed in the presence of notaries during the first six weeks of the campaign. A striking unanimity of sentiment for public ownership was encountered—in a community that previously had stood out consistently against it. The labor movement was apparently a unit for it. A surprisingly large percentage of the business men, from the corner-grocery man to the representative of big business, wanted it; in many instances they not only signed the petitions, but pledged their aid. The majority of professional men and members of the educated class seemed to have suddenly become supporters of public ownership. What appeared strange at first but is perhaps not so surprising, many stockholders of the Utah Power and Light Company, which would be driven from Salt Lake City by a municipal plant, signed and promised aid in the campaign. The sponsors of the movement are confident of overwhelming victory. Apparently nothing but an unlikely reversal of sentiment after the forces hostile to the referendum get into action can prevent this important experiment in direct legislation from being carried out.

What lies behind this struggle and the changed public attitude? The Democratic Party wrote the initiative and referendum into its platform in 1916, and the measure was supported by some of the ablest men in the State. Yet although the Democrats won the election and controlled the 1917 legislature, great difficulty was experienced in getting the measure enacted in workable form. Opposed to it was a choice aggregation of special interests which managed to emasculate the bill by successive amendments and finally to eliminate entirely the provision for the recall of unsatisfactory public officials. Nevertheless, the law emerged, despite imposed handicaps, in workable form. It encountered, however, a public wholly unprepared for such advanced legislation. Not only did the special interests largely control the machinery for formulating public opinion, but the influence of the dominant church, embracing two-thirds of the electorate and heavily involved in capitalistic investments, was reactionary. Influenced by these two forces the Utah voters seemed opposed to any change. For sixteen years any use of the initiative and referendum law in so conservative an electorate offered difficulties no progressive group dared to face.

The movement for municipal ownership has advanced more slowly in Utah cities than in most Western communities. Only nineteen small towns, of which the largest, Logan, has only 10,000 inhabitants, have municipal power and light plants. This apathy toward public ownership has deprived the community of an effective stimulus to the use of the initiative and referendum.

Then came the depression, destroying Utah's conservatism. A rising tide of resentment was directed against the corporation which owns most of the public utilities in Utah, the Utah Power and Light Company, whose stock scandals and racketeering methods had been disclosed by the Federal Trade Commission. The belief has become widespread in Utah that the Utah Power and Light Company has abused its monopoly powers and that it unduly influences town and city governments. A branch of the Electric Bond and Share Company of New York, it siphons vast sums of money out of the pockets of Utah consumers and empties them into the pockets of Wall Street magnates. When the depression came, the company laid off large numbers of wage- and salary-earners and lowered the pay of others, but stubbornly maintained the high price of its product. Though its electricity is produced from cheap mountain water power, its charges to householders run as high as 9 cents per kilowatt-hour, while its lowest rate is a combination rate of 5 cents

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

per kilowatt-hour. Although prosperous, it chose this year to suspend dividends on its preferred stock. While it thus withheld dividends from many stockholders, its gross income was more than $9,000,000 for the year. The stock on which it failed to pay dividends was non-voting stock. Thus a large group of stockholders, deprived of voting rights in the corporation and powerless, was left holding an empty sack.

Their resentment was accentuated by a recent Federal Trade Commission report which revealed that the Utah Power and Light Company continued to pay dividends to a favored inner group on $35,000,000 of watered stock. The company boasts that it is "publicly" owned through the wide diffusion of its stock. But many of the owners of the stock are beginning to realize that holding allotments of non-par, non-voting stock, too small to affect their incomes appreciably, is a very unsatisfactory form of "public ownership." They are telling the referendum field workers that real public ownership offers them much more, through cheaper rates, than they can hope for from the kind of "public ownership" the Utah Power and Light Company provides. They say further that the successive high-pressure stock-selling campaigns put over by the corporation were apparently a method of bribing the public and buying its allegiance in order to prevent real public ownership.

This first use of Utah's long-neglected initiative and referendum law, under conditions which make victory seem highly probable, is significant mainly for what it promises. Men never before interested in public ownership and in the initiative and referendum are flocking to support this new movement. Among them are persons prominent in business, educational, professional, and labor fields. A powerful movement is being built around the future use of the initiative and referendum as an instrument of democratic socialization. Utah liberals are beginning to comprehend that in such laws may lie the solution of many of America's present troubles. A victory for the initiative and referendum and its immediate objective—an ample power plant for Salt Lake City's 140,000 inhabitants—will undoubtedly impress the people with a new sense of power and a realization of the potentialities of the law. It will also do a great deal to establish a strong organization for the future utilization of this instrument of democracy.

With its amazing natural resources Utah offers an especially inviting field for public ownership through direct legislation. Potentially it is one of the greatest coal and iron States in the union. Yet these resources are virtually suppressed—the best iron ores lie untouched in the ground, industry languishes, mining towns die and become ghost cities, thousands of men are unemployed—while gas is piped into Utah and oil and gasoline are imported from long distances at high rates. The organizers of the new movement firmly believe that Utah's gigantic resources will never be developed under the present American set-up of private monopoly. They believe they must be developed and used in the future by the State.

In order to insure the immediate acquisition of the proposed power plant, the cost of which must not exceed $18,000,000, the promoters of the referendum have selected A. C. Todd and R. H. Doelle as the municipal-ownership candidates for city commissioners. The initiative and referendum law, however, is mandatory. If the majority of the citizens vote on November 7 for the ordinance no executive or body can veto their mandate. Even an adverse administration would be obliged under the law to carry out the provisions of the ordinance.

[*This is the eleventh of a series of article on electric power and the consumer. The twelfth will appear in an early issue.*]

In the Driftway

THE Drifter has mentioned before in this column that delightful English quarterly the *Countryman,* a bright-green magazine devoted to country life not as it is practiced by the plain farmer nor yet as it is abused by the elaborate rich but as it is enjoyed by that great in-between group of men and women who love the country road and the solitary house for their own sake. Such people may, of course, be rich. But usually they have an in-between income as well, and if they live in the country they must do so on a windfall pittance that allows for no modern trimmings to life or a job in town which often demands the cream both of their energy and their time. The love of country life is proverbial and of long standing in England. It is well established and fast growing in America if the Drifter is any judge, and he is wondering when it will reach the point at which an American counterpart of the *Countryman* could be launched on a self-supporting basis. He is convinced that the time is almost ripe. And he herewith applies for the job of editor.

* * * * *

TO be sure, many magazines in this country might be cited—by one who knows not the *Countryman*—as magazines of country life. But though the Drifter may not have seen them all, it is his impression that most of them are designed either for the estate or the suburb, neither of which in the Drifter's strict judgment can be considered country. Many of these magazines are useful and entertaining in their fields, but they are either snobbish and expensive or entirely practical. (How many new ways of doing old chores have been invented in the last ten years along with gadgets for doing them that must be advertised and sold?) In either case they fall far short of providing the satisfying fodder for country-loving souls in which the *Countryman* abounds. The Drifter has not forgotten, either, the American farm magazine. He reads two of them regularly to recapture the delights of barnyards and fresh eggs and mild-eyed cows. But these publications, being designed for the responsible working farmer must naturally regard the daily life of the farm as a not very exciting routine. Their pages therefore lack, for the dilettante farmer, those overtones of nostalgia and pleasant irresponsibility which are necessary to a city farmer's fireside reading.

* * * * *

CONSIDER the *Countryman* for July, 1933. The Drifter has just finished reading the thick little book—and that is significant. The *Countryman* is published only quarterly. No doubt other and economic reasons are involved, but the Drifter likes to think that the editor is wise enough to know that for an honest countryman who must

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

constantly inspect his acres, four times a year is often enough to get a magazine, and that it is his job to provide in each issue enough solid and satisfying material to last until the next quarter comes around. The device works admirably for the Drifter, and a random view of the contents will indicate why. The *Countryman,* in the first place, contains 287 pages. Of these, 131 pages are occupied with an enormous variety and number of subjects. Here is a representative list: The Sins of Rachel Stickney—the "memuranduns" of a ten-year-old girl, Rachel, who lived on a farm in the East Riding of Yorkshire in 1799; My Cottage That Was a Barn, by H. E. Bates, novelist; Oversea Birds in Aviaries and at Liberty, by the Marquess of Tavistock; the second instalment of a symposium on The Dog in the Car: Why Is He So Pleased? which has included the opinions of Professor Julian Huxley, Professor J. B. S. Haldane, Sir Frederick Hobday, Mazo de la Roche, Ernest Thompson Seton, and many other important people; the ninth instalment of My Island, Our Life There, a charming account by R. M. Lockley, who with his wife and baby and a goat (for milk) live happily and adventurously on a remote island; The Country House Aeroplane: Making a Landing Field; My Tenth Year of Farming, a statistical account of a scientific farmer. It also contains recipes, household and garden hints, Country Books of the Quarter, correspondence, and a wealth of short items, funny and serious, on life in the country in all its various aspects.

* * * * *

IT remains to be said that the *Countryman,* while it is printed in readable type, would cause a high-powered make-up editor, not to mention the advertising manager, to roar with laughter. It is decorated with inferior photographs badly reproduced, a good woodcut or two, and very prosaic though efficient maps where needed. But the Drifter and the *Countryman* have the last laugh. It has already been noted that 131 of the *Countryman's* 287 pages are devoted to many subjects. The remaining 156 pages are taken up with paid advertising. THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

Eisenstein and Upton Sinclair

TO THE EDITORS OF THE NATION:

I agree with Mr. Troy that it would have been just fine if Seragei Eisenstein had edited the Mexican film, "Thunder over Mexico." That he did not do so was Mr. Eisenstein's own fault. For a whole year Upton Sinclair refused to present his side of the story to the public because he thought there should be no rows between Communists and Socialists. I think he was mistaken, because this dispute about the Eisenstein film had nothing to do with either the Communist or the Socialist Party. Meantime his opponents have been heard loudly and frequently. These opponents did not speak for Moscow.

The Soviet government objected to Mr. Eisenstein's remaining so long in Mexico. It wanted him to come home and make the picture he was under contract to make for Soyuzkino, but he refused to come. Mr. Eisenstein did not tell the Sinclairs of the situation until after the Russians notified them. He is a great artist and so the Russians forgave him, but they could hardly be expected, after that, to pay out money for the picture he made against their orders.

Upton Sinclair does not own the picture. It is owned by a group of people. At the cost of agonizing effort Upton and Craig Sinclair induced their friends to put up the money for it. The people who put up the money own the picture. Mr. Eisenstein at no time expressed gratitude or appreciation to these people and he was definitely rude to them on a number of occasions. These happen to be the same individuals who usually give money to get Communists and Socialists out of jail, support radical publications, and so on. A woman in California had agreed to give $10,000 to enable Eisenstein to start his Mexican film before his permit from the American government to remain here had expired. Offended by an exceedingly selfish action on Mr. Eisenstein's part, this woman withdrew her $10,000. There was consternation until Mrs. Sinclair said: "Don't worry, I will mortgage my home." "Quite a capitalist, aren't you?" said Mr. Eisenstein cynically, but took the $10,000.

When Eisenstein originally talked the thing over with Upton Sinclair he said that he would need $25,000 and three months' time. For a whole year he was in Mexico demanding more and more money, while the Sinclairs were desperately trying to raise it for him. When they had obtained nearly $100,000, they were unable to get another cent from anybody and had to stop Mr. Eisenstein's passionate photographing. From that moment on Mr. Eisenstein was furiously angry with the Sinclairs.

Mr. Troy objects to the fact that commercial Hollywood worked on the picture. I happened to be in Los Angeles while Upton Sinclair was trying idealistic and non-commercial and even Russian-trained editors. The result of their work was lifeless. Finally he turned it over to someone who made a professional job of it. If Eisenstein had kept his word or been reasonably courteous to the backers of this picture they would, I think, have sacrificed all the money they had put into it and eaten out of his hand.

New York, August 8 HELEN WOODWARD

Chicago University's Policy

TO THE EDITORS OF THE NATION:

"A Princetonian," in his letter published in your issue of September 27, accuses President Robert M. Hutchins of the University of Chicago of defending the policy of maintaining the salaries of full professors at the expense of dropping younger members of the profession from their jobs. This is a misapprehension. Mr. Hutchins, in his article in the *Yale Review,* did not advocate such a policy. He merely stated that it was being followed by many institutions. So far as the University of Chicago itself is concerned, it has not been followed. I know of no one who has been chopped from the staff during the depression for reasons of economy. Such reductions in the staff as have occurred have been the result of retirements, resignations, and leaves of absence without replacements. This is certainly the most humane way of decreasing the size of the staff, although it is obviously a policy which cannot be continued for many years.

The university has effected its chief economies by cutting down administrative expenses, readjusting courses as between the different branches of university work, and finally (and reluctantly) by reducing salaries. This reduction was steeply progressive, so that those with higher salaries suffered a larger percentage reduction than those in the lower ranks. President Hutchins's salary was, at his own request, cut most of all, and in characteristic fashion he tried to cut it still further.

Chicago, September 25 PAUL H. DOUGLAS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labor Racketeering

To the Editors of The Nation:

Do you not think that the article entitled Labor Racketeering in your issue of August 16 was just a little out of place and untimely? Not that I deny that it is the duty of a liberal magazine with *The Nation's* reputation for fearlessness to speak plainly on every issue, be that issue labor unionism or anything else, but it seems to me it was quite an effort for the writer to produce sufficient evidence without smearing Kaplan's name from the beginning to the end of the article.

Having been a member of the American Federation of Labor for thirty-three years, I would be the last person to claim that there has never been a suspicion of crookedness against any of its members, but I do say without fear of contradiction that, compared with commercial, lodge, or even church organizations, we are a shining example of honesty and integrity.

I say the article was untimely, for even an editorial writer should realize that there is no organization in the country at the present time on whose shoulders rests a greater responsibility for helping to make the NRA program effective than that borne by the A. F. of L.

San José, Cal., August 19 Harry Warmke

Finance

The New Deal May Protect the Rail Investor

THE Wall Street octopus, which has thrown its tentacles around the pending bankruptcy reorganizations of four of the major railroads of the country, is facing a real threat to its power from the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. These two governmental bodies, endowed with new and far-reaching authority over railroad reorganizations, have already committed themselves, tacitly or openly, to policies which, if carried out, will cut off at its source much of the control traditionally exercised by the great banking groups over railroads, before, during, and after bankruptcy.

The four large railroads now in bankruptcy or receivership are the Missouri Pacific, the Rock Island, the St. Louis-San Francisco, and the Wabash. Reorganization of the four roads on an equitable and efficient basis is of paramount importance to the public interest. The roads operate 29,000 miles of track through important agricultural and industrial areas. To the security-owning public they represent an investment of $1,700,000,000. But the morass of conflicting purposes in which all these roads are now imbedded through the tangle of banking and insurance interests cooperating or competing for the control of their reorganization demonstrates that the only hope for a sound readjustment of these properties lies in the intervention of an impartial public authority.

The protective-committee system, which usually functions to protect vested management and banking control rather than the security holders whose support it asks for, is in full sway over these properties. Moreover, a cursory examination of the interrelations of the various interests represented on these protective committees is indicative of how little real protection the public can expect from their efforts. Banking and insurance firms which strenuously opposed the plan of reorganization proposed by the 'Frisco management as unjust to bond-holders and unduly favorable to stockholders find no embarrassment in concurrently serving on protective committees for Rock Island bond issues with representatives of the same institutions which backed the 'Frisco plan and under conditions suggesting a philosophy of reorganization similar to that attempted by the 'Frisco. The same alternate enemies and allies appear on a protective committee for one Missouri Pacific bond issue, and show no reluctance to sharing their zeal for protection with the house of Morgan, whose chief qualifications for protecting the bondholders arise from its role as bankers for the road, for the Alleghany Corporation, which holds a 46 per cent stock interest in Missouri Pacific, and for the Van Sweringen brothers, whose continued dominance of the road hinges principally on the fate of the common stock. Again, in the Wabash receivership, representatives of several of the same institutions have set themselves up as protectors of the bond-holders along with a representative of Kuhn, Loeb and Company, bankers for the Pennsylvania Railroad, which owns 48 per cent of the Wabash stock.

There is nothing unusual in the web of conflicting private interests surrounding these railroad receiverships. It is all part and parcel of the Wall Street game of assuring that bankers and management shall never be called on to answer for their conduct of business enterprises but shall continue their dominance, free of all real responsibility. None but the Wall Street mind could escape realizing the patent absurdity of a system which intrusts bankruptcy estates and reorganized companies to the same interests which conducted them into insolvency. Under such conditions it is inevitable that the interests of the security-owning public should rank secondary to the vested interests unless some impartial authority intervenes to dictate in true equity.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, which under the new amendment to the bankruptcy act must approve all railroad-reorganization plans before they are submitted to security holders for ratification, and which, if necessary, is empowered to write its own plan, has not laid down any official expression of its views on reorganization. But the attitude of various of its members and particularly of Joseph B. Eastman, the federal Coordinator of Railroads, on the need for impartial and thoroughgoing reorganizations is well known. Furthermore, the commission's recent refusal to authorize a Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan to the Western Pacific Railroad on the ground that the road was in need of financial reorganization indicates that the commission is prepared to enforce rigorously its new powers. Likewise, the pressure recently exerted by the commission on the Wabash receivers to attempt recovery of excessive payments made in the past to the road's former president is in contrast to the usual whitewashing of executives in railroad bankruptcies.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, unrestricted by the semi-judicial capacity of the commission and having a direct stake of some $331,000,000 in the nation's railroads, has been relatively aggressive in attacking existing railroad practices ever since the Hoover regime lost control over its policies. The corporation was the strongest opponent of the 'Frisco reorganization plan and will have chief credit if the plan is rejected, as now seems probable. It was instrumental in causing the appointment of a special master, independent of the trustees of the road, to inquire into the notorious deal whereby the Missouri Pacific took over various terminal properties from a subsidiary of the Alleghany Corporation at an excessive price of $20,300,000. It has petitioned the Federal Court for a trusteeship for the 'Frisco to supplant the present receivership management. Moreover, the corporation has sponsored a theory of railroad reorganization which offers impediments to Wall Street methods of controlling bankruptcies. When it petitioned the Federal Court recently for appointment of trustees to take over the Chicago and Eastern Illinois Railroad, a Van Sweringen road, the corporation said:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> The debtor's [i.e., the railroad's] interest in its properties prevents it from formulating and presenting any plan of reorganization that will do justice to all classes of creditors and stockholders alike. . . . A disinterested trustee . . . can and will give adequate consideration to the interests of all classes of creditors and stockholders. . . . The interest of the debtor, as the owner of the equity of its properties, is adverse to the interests of the bondholders and the other creditors.

It is still too early to raise the flag for a victory of the public interest over Wall Street railroad control. The first real test will come when the Interstate Commerce Commission reaches a final decision on the St. Louis-San Francisco reorganization this fall. At that time it will be seen how the new policies fare when confronted with the full weight of Wall Street guile and expert legal counsel. It will be ironical if the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, conceived by Herbert Hoover to bail out big business and high finance, ends by thwarting those interests in one of their most typical functions of public exploitation. But it will be of vastly greater importance if the Interstate Commerce Commission, equipped at last with adequate authority over financial reorganizations, brings effective regulation to the most vulnerable spot in the public's ownership of railroad securities. PETER HELMOOP NOYES

Contributors to This Issue

EDITH ABBOTT is dean of the Graduate School of Social Service Administration at the University of Chicago.

PAUL Y. ANDERSON is a Washington correspondent of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*.

LOUIS FISCHER is Moscow correspondent of *The Nation* and author of "Machines and Men in Russia."

CAROLYN CONANT VAN BLARCOM is a graduate of the Johns Hopkins School of Nursing, and was for several years assistant superintendent of that school. She was director of the Atlantic division of the nursing service of the American Red Cross during the war, and is the author of "Obstetrical Nursing" and other books.

MURRAY E. KING is a native of Utah who has long been identified with liberal and labor interests in that State.

EDA LOU WALTON is associate professor of English at Washington Square College, New York University.

PAUL H. DOUGLAS is professor of industrial relations at the University of Chicago.

WILLIAM TROY is a member of the English department of Washington Square College, New York University.

The Literary Editor of *The Nation* writes his first important book

READERS of *The Nation* will find, in *The Anatomy of Criticism*, HENRY HAZLITT's new book, the equivalent of spending a charming evening around a fire discussing the functions of the critic, his problems and the relations of those problems to books and life.

In a witty and thoroughly modern trialogue, Mr. Young, Mr. Middleton and Mr. Elder, three critics representing three different generations and schools of thought, discuss the following topics: (and no punches are pulled)

The critic's function; literary standards; the verdict of posterity; realism versus romance; tradition and rebellion.

The growing class of American readers who in other days would have savored SAINTE-BEUVE and MATTHEW ARNOLD and the author's namesake, WILLIAM HAZLITT—people who wish to enjoy books thoughtfully; in short—will discover many new twists to old problems in *The Anatomy of Criticism*. Price $2.50.

"A fresh and brilliant contribution to the endless discussion of criticism." —ELLEN GLASGOW

THE ANATOMY OF CRITICISM By HENRY HAZLITT

SIMON AND SCHUSTER, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

The Dilemma of the Supreme Court

WHAT about the Constitution? Maurice Finkelstein in *The Nation* next week asks this question in an article dealing with the relation of the Supreme Court to the NRA and the AAA. He points out that they involve a revolutionary departure in national economic policy and wonders if the Supreme Court will accept the revolution embodied in the New Deal.

Mr. Finkelstein believes that the court, in spite of its record of blocking "all reform efforts to curb business greed," will make its decision in accord with the popular will expressed in the new legislation. He gives chapter and verse to support his opinion. Get next week's *Nation* (issue of October 18) and read this acute and amazing exposition.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books, Films, Drama

First Day of Autumn

By EDA LOU WALTON

Haze gone and the outlines clear now,
Each tree its own extension and its round,
Hills suddenly perfected, and the mound
Of green field rolling near now.

Day whole, and the striving over;
Each leaf, each grass blade, every laurel won,
Earth quiet mirroring the sun,
As lake the swan, full stream, the clover.

Hours of deep acquiescence cannot sever yet,
Nor is completion bitter yet nor lost.
This first fall day, nor evening nor the frost—
Forever is forever yet.

Gold, red, and bitter winter, I have been happy here!
Chill stars and wedging darkness, blinding cold,
Another chapter after this story told,
Not this proud day's to hear!

"Fascism Is Capitalism"

The Menace of Fascism. By John Strachey. Covici-Friede. $2.25.

IN January of this year John Strachey's "The Coming Struggle for Power" was published here. The book is by far the best contemporary statement in English of the case for communism. To begin with, Mr. Strachey, as befits a cousin of the late Lytton Strachey, is a first-rate writer, and what little his style lacks in finish it more than makes up in directness and force. "The Coming Struggle" is written with an astonishing abstention from the usual Marxian jargon; this is no doubt partly deliberate, but it is also partly owing to the fact that Mr. Strachey has a mind of his own and that his book is freshly thought. When Mr. Strachey writes about bourgeois literary figures he does not make the mistake so common in other Marxian critics of underrating them. More importantly—and what is so rare that it is, with two or three exceptions, practically unknown among our own Marxists—Mr. Strachey knows orthodox economics; he really knows what the arguments are by which modern capitalist economists attempt to defend capitalism; and as a result, when he caricatures those arguments his caricature is a telling one. Further, he has been a Labor member of the House of Commons, and his political discussions are instructive and realistic. And finally, he is a masterly controversialist, and whether or not one accepts his position, it is a joy to watch the skill with which he lassoes the Messrs. Keynes, Wells, and Aldous Huxley. Certainly "The Coming Struggle" is one of the half-dozen most important volumes to appear in the last three years. It is difficult to see how it can be refused a place in the New Testament of the Marxian Bible.

"The Menace of Fascism" does not compare with it in importance or quality. "The Coming Struggle" was written with a fine arrogance, and a hearty contempt for capitalists and liberals. The book on fascism, however, is less a diagnosis and more a pamphlet; the dominant tone has perceptibly changed to one of indignation and alarm. For between "The Coming Struggle" and the present volume, the brown terror has come to reign in Germany.

Mr. Strachey's fundamental thesis is simple. Fascism, he holds, is nothing more nor less than the movement for the preservation by violence, and at all costs, of the private ownership of the means of production. It is capitalism's last desperate stand. Its other characteristics—its blood-lust, its anti-Semitism, its intolerance of all liberals and pacifists, its violent and unparalleled nationalism, which must lead inevitably to war, "war for space and employment," its implacable enmity to the whole progressive movement of the last century, to democracy and liberty and tolerance, to culture itself—flow inevitably from this central aim.

Now there are some important facts to support this thesis, and other facts that are more refractory. In defending the thesis Mr. Strachey is driven into several self-contradictions. Fascism involves of course a dictatorship, with the ruthlessness of all dictatorships; and whatever else it may be, it is certainly not a dictatorship in the interests of the proletariat. Mr. Strachey is on solid ground when he shows the absurdity of the fascists' claim that they are able to combine all the advantages of capitalism with all the benefits of socialism—in other words, that they are able to combine the private ownership of the means of production with a politically planned system of production. He has little trouble in showing that the two conditions are irreconcilable. And he is certainly within the facts also when he holds that the so-called "corporate state" in Italy is a fraud; that fascism in practice has hitherto left the holders of property relatively undisturbed, that it has in no way mitigated the severity of economic crises, and that its chief economic contribution to date has been to make the arbitration of labor disputes compulsory and strikes illegal.

So far so good. But if fascism is a weapon in the hands of the capitalists, it is certainly the most treacherous one, from their own standpoint, that they have ever held, with a terrific backfire that may well prove fatal to the user. And even most capitalists recognize this. No doubt it is true, as Mr. Strachey remarks, that the Nazis were originally supported by a few capitalists, and financed by them. But the Nazis did not have the support of the great majority of capitalists. On the contrary, a great part of their crazy platform was in effect a nationalistic communism, and it was these communistic promises that gave them an enormous part of their popular support. Mr. Strachey implies that the Nazis were deliberately duping the masses in these pre-power promises, and that all the time the great bankers and industrialists were privy to the deception. But that interpretation is too implausible to swallow. It implies not only an immense gullibility on the part of the German peasants, lower middle classes, and even of the proletariat, but a cold rationality on the part of Hitler and other leading Nazis, and a far-seeing Machiavellian astuteness on the part of German capitalists, that no reasonably close psychological observer could accept. I cannot imagine most of the great German capitalists listening to some of the former speeches of Hitler without very genuine shivers in the spine.

Obviously most of them would be reconciled to the Nazi weapon only if and when they were convinced that it was the sole alternative to what all of them regard as the still greater evil of communism. Mr. Strachey holds that this is, in fact, the only alternative presented to all of us. "The only possible way out for the progressive movements is to end the private ownership of the means of production. . . . Our alternative is a working-class socialist civilization, or the destruction of all civilization and a return to the dark ages." The "inevitability of gradualness," he maintains, is a delusion and a snare; it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

involves a halt and finally a retreat. Belief in that policy undid the Social Democrats in Germany, and the policy will undo the same groups in England, France, and the United States if they persist in following it. The great democracies are "only democracies for the ruling classes"; a violent struggle is inevitable; the capitalists will fight to the last ditch to retain their property and privileges; and the only salvation for the workers is to be the first to strike.

Mr. Strachey's logic is perhaps difficult to answer if one accepts his premises. But if we put the names of nations where he puts those of classes, how familiar his phrases and logic suddenly become! These are the phrases of militarism. This is the logic of jingoism, always and everywhere. *We* are just and reasonable and inherently peaceful; *we* are capable of disinterestedness and concession, but we are right and our enemy is wrong, and machine-guns are the only argument that he will understand. But suppose your enemy adopts precisely the same position? Mr. Strachey is aware of this danger, but he holds that the Communists must win because "90 per cent of the people of every country are the natural opponents of fascism." This either fails to account for the success of fascism in Germany and Italy, or admits that the lower middle classes who accept and support those fascisms are very easily duped; in which case one wonders why they cannot be just as easily duped in England, France, and the United States? If fascists create Communists, Communists no less inevitably breed fascists.

Perhaps Mr. Strachey might reexamine the merits of democracy. True, he holds at one point that the fascists never have to seize power, really; their struggle with the older forms of the capitalist state is just a "stage battle"; they seize power only in the sense that they seize it "from under their own pillows." But we find him admitting at other points that democratic power and the general franchise *do* undermine capitalism—for that is really why the fascists are so desperately anxious to get rid of them! Let him not forget that through democratic methods up to 80 per cent of British inheritances are already seized, and up to 63 per cent of the high American incomes. Democracy can take a good deal more, I believe, perhaps as much as it may require, before Mr. J. P. Morgan and Mr. Owen D. Young begin getting out their automatics.

HENRY HAZLITT

How Great Was Shakespeare?

Art and Artifice in Shakespeare. By E. R. Stoll. The Macmillan Company. $4.

On Reading Shakespeare. By Logan Pearsall Smith. Harcourt, Brace and Company. $1.50.

NO one who is interested in contemporary attitudes toward Shakespeare, or who supposes, perchance, that the last words upon the subject were said by Goethe or Brandes, Bradley or Lee, should miss either of these volumes. In the first, the most learned (and dogmatic) of the American scholars sums up the hard-boiled position which, for a number of years, he has been defending through a series of truculent studies. In the second, a cultivated amateur, thoroughly familiar with this as well as other common-sense approaches to the "mystery" of Shakespeare, eludes them as best he can and makes an often convincing case for the kind of idolatry against which Professor Stoll's works are a reaction. Mr. Smith has not, perhaps, either the strength of such another champion of his attitude as Dover Wilson or such a powerful system-building imagination as G. Wilson Knight, but he knows his Shakespeare and will defend apologetically, when he cannot defend aggressively, his right to read "Hamlet" as something more than a curious example of Elizabethan stage conventions.

Professor Stoll, it should be explained, is one of those who believe that a study of Shakespeare's time furnishes the only key to an understanding of the plays. To him most of the "interpretations" which were made during the nineteenth century and, indeed, most of the very "problems" discovered and solved are pure nonsense. Both the difficulties themselves and the solutions which have been offered grow out of a ridiculous tendency to apply to the dramatist standards of which he had never heard and psychological principles in which he had not the slightest interest. Hundreds of thousands of words have been wasted in the attempt to make Othello's gullibility seem convincing, and to account on psychological grounds for Hamlet's delay, when all the labored and ingenious explanations are so much moonshine. The real explanation of the first difficulty is merely that by violating a law of probability Shakespeare precipitated a striking situation; the real explanation of the second is merely that if Hamlet had not delayed, there would have been no play. If you insist upon taking too literally the statement that Shakespeare was "not for a day but for all time"; if you think of him as a creature above humanity who somehow mysteriously anticipated all subsequent developments of intellect and sensibility; if, in a word, and like the early romantic critics, you regard him not as a dramatist but as a "fact of nature," then, of course, all sorts of unsolvable problems are sure to arise. But the proper way to understand "Hamlet," for example, is not to regard the hero as a real person, or even as a modern psychological character. The proper way is to examine the tradition of the "revenge play" in which "Hamlet" was written, and if you do so you will discover that the technical problem was always the same. It was always the problem of keeping the thing going for five acts, and the problem was solved by Shakespeare in a fashion which is dramatically very effective but which will not stand up if you attempt to analyze it psychologically. Here as everywhere Shakespeare was interested in dramatic action and vivid contrasts rather than in strict verisimilitude, and so—as Professor Stoll is ready to prove by citations from the opinions of the chief classical critics from Aristotle on down, and by examples of the practice of successful dramatists from Aeschylus to Philip Barry and Eugene O'Neill—have most of the great writers of most times. Art is artifice; it is not life.

Undoubtedly the historical scholars of whom Professor Stoll is a brilliant representative have put their opponents on the defensive, just as the minute students of Shakespeare's life have put on the defensive all those who would see in him anything more than a practical man of the Elizabethan theater. In both cases, moreover, the answer—in so far as there is an answer—is simply an appeal to the fact that this alleged business man certainly wrote supreme poetry, and that this manipulator of the tricks of a tradition has continued to fascinate the mind of the whole literate world while all of his contemporaries have sunk into the position of mere curiosities. Undoubtedly one must begin by granting Professor Stoll and his party a great deal of all that they maintain. Shakespeare certainly was an often unscrupulous trickster, and there are certainly dozens of major inconsistencies or major outrages against credulity of which the only sensible thing to say is that the Elizabethan audience was willing to swallow them for the sake of what they made possible. Yet there is grave danger in leaping to the conclusion that Shakespeare is *nothing but* what, in part, he indubitably was.

Mr. Smith, for example, refers to that brilliant anticipation of modern criticism, Morgann's eighteenth-century essay on Falstaff. He points out how true is Morgann's contention that many of Shakespeare's characters differ from the characters of other dramatists in that Shakespeare has managed, by incidental touches, to endow them with histories as well as qualities in addition to those necessarily revealed in the particular actions

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which bring them into the play itself. And this, be it noted, is extremely important both as a fact and for what it suggests of Shakespeare's method. He did adopt the stage conventions; he did often draw characters which were in whole or in part essentially dramatic puppets. But he was seldom content with that alone. He may have violated psychological probability in the short cut which he takes to precipitate the situation in "Othello"; but it is hard to see how anyone who studies the words and behavior of the central character *after he has been placed in the situation* could maintain that Shakespeare was not interested in psychology. He adopted the conventions of his time; not seldom he allowed himself to be dominated by them; but he was not content to remain always their slave, and in addition to the poetry, there are reachings out toward things wholly beyond the conventions themselves. The only unity of his plays is perhaps a dramatic unity. The only consistent whole they make is that of an effective Elizabethan play. But like all great artists Shakespeare could make the tradition serve his purpose; he could take what was given by an old story or a popular situation and so use it that it became a not unsuitable vehicle for saying what he had to say. Nor does it seem unreasonable to suppose that the thing which has kept him alive is, in large part at least, just this thing which distinguishes him from the rest of that company of practical playwrights of which he made one. Art is artifice. But the artifice owes its meaning to the fact that it has, here and there, its pertinence to life.

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Robinson's Women

Talifer. By Edwin Arlington Robinson. The Macmillan Company. $1.75.

"TALIFER" is a modern love story, the first *modern* love story Robinson has given us. The only love story, one might say, besides "Tristram." For most of Robinson's stories about men and women are really, even when love is one of the motifs, stories of psychological and philosophical inquiry. In them a woman may set the man or men to thinking, but once the main characters (always masculine) are busy within their own minds, the woman plays small part in anything that may result from such a masculine searching out and analyzing of values. Robinson's long narrative poems are all concerned with Robinson's own philosophy, and this is put usually into the mouth of one male character who is the interpreter. In the use of the interpreter Robinson and Henry James have much in common. Never, so far as I can recall, does Robinson use a woman's mind as the sensitive lens whereon the scene and action of a poem and their inner meaning are inscribed. Obviously, he does not consider women the proper vehicles for the interpretation of such speculative and synthetic philosophizing as he, the artist, must present.

Even in this new poem, "Talifer," neither Althea nor Karen, the two women who possess Talifer (the outwardly glorious and somewhat empty hero), nor Talifer himself is allowed the part of interpreter. This is given to Dr. Quick, their mutual friend. His somewhat quixotic action prevents emotional disaster. He is the philosopher and, as usual in Robinson's poetry, he is a failure so far as worldly standards are concerned. He has loved, after his fashion, both Althea and Karen; he has admired and seen through the handsome shell of Talifer. He tells Althea to wait when she must wait or perish. He foresees that Talifer and Karen are to be bad mates. He takes Karen away when she should go. He is neither shocked nor destroyed when Karen plays on him the very same tricks she has played on Talifer.

So Althea and Karen join the group of Robinson's women—Vivian, Gabrielle, Laramie, Agatha, Lisette, Eileen, Natalie, and the others. Even their names portray them. One and all they are pictures of what Robinson conceives the feminine mind to be. Either they are fire, or they are water. They burn men, distract them from their natural pursuits, or they quietly reflect men's gentler faces. They mother and they worship, or they destroy by too much passion or too little. Althea, in this last poem, is obviously the mother. Karen, beautiful, but very cool of brain, is the frigid siren. She has Vivian's beauty, but none of Vivian's passion. She resembles the dark Isolde, but lacks that lady's depth of feeling about love. Althea very definitely resembles the fair and faithful Isolde. And both these women, like so many of Robinson's, are somewhat feline: Althea is the domesticated pussy; Karen, the neurotic wildcat. Reading this last poem of Robinson's convinces one again that this poet knows very little about the possible complexities of women, that his women are in fact not real at all, but are projections of some need in man. They are therefore a little tiresome and, decidedly, they are painted in conventional romantic poses. None of them do anything except to answer men or to refuse to answer them. Most of them, one feels, are just a little in the way. They seem to keep men from spiritual research, to tame men's leaping imaginations and intellects. They are absolutely worthless as fine critics of life, as commentators upon the deeper significance of living.

All this may be beside the point, but it is an amusing observation. "Talifer" is a love story, but it contains, as do all Robinson's poems, some few fine passages of poetic philosophy; it is, of course, beautifully written. I doubt if it is nearly as important a poem in Robinson's whole scheme as are "Cavendar's House," "The Glory of the Nightingales," "Matthias at the Door." In it Robinson seems to have tried to avoid his usual complexity of thought, seems to have tried, as he did in "Tristram," merely to tell the tale perfectly. "Talifer," like "Tristram," presents, therefore, much less of what is truly Robinson the poet. This we find in the less popular "Matthias at the Door" and in "Merlin."

EDA LOU WALTON

Rhodes's Dark Empire

Cecil Rhodes. By Sarah Gertrude Millin. Harper and Brothers. $3.75.

Cecil Rhodes. By J. G. Lockhart. Great Lives Series. The Macmillan Company. 75 cents.

Cecil Rhodes. By William Plomer. Appleton Biographies. D. Appleton–Century Company. $1.50.

WHEN Stanley traversed the interior of Africa he saw this rich virgin land, with its navigable rivers and lakes, as a vacuum yearning to be filled with civilization. It was in the nineties, when the industrialized Occident was at the height of its self-assurance, its certainty of being the most enlightened, prosperous, powerful, and humane society ever developed in the world. On his return to Europe Stanley could, without personal hypocrisy, apply to both missionaries and commercial exploiters for help, confident that he was working to uplift humanity in Africa, body and soul. Stanley lived to see his hope reduced to corruption under the exploitation of the king-capitalist, Leopold of Belgium, who had first posed before him as a stock-market Parsifal entering Africa with the chivalrous motive of rescuing that dark and opulent beauty from savagery. While capitalist imperialism was devastating Africa, the trembling, fever-stricken Stanley solaced his last years by laying out on an English farm the topography, in miniature, of the unspoiled continent he had opened to exploitation.

Somewhat later, in another part of Africa, a young tubercular Englishman was founding a fortune. At an early age he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was a millionaire, a monopolist in diamonds, profiting from the tradition that marriages could not be made on earth without diamond engagement rings, and calculating the output of his mines by the available vital statistics. In him the imperialist ideology came to its climax, a repellent, racial narcissism that bordered on lunacy.

It was a compound of nationalism, evolution, and self-righteousness. The rationalization took this approximate course: Darwin taught that life kept perfecting itself by killing off, through hardship and competitive struggle, the weaker and less adaptable strains. In view of the position of England in the world, it seemed self-evident that the English were the superior strain among human stocks, and that it would be good for all civilization if this preeminence were acknowledged and put into practical effect by the extension of the British Empire to cover the entire globe. This ambition, nourished on misunderstandings of history and misinterpretations of science, Cecil Rhodes brought with him to Africa as a youth, and it continued with him, modified by practical experience, to the end of his life. To realize it he used his own fortune, money supplied by stock-market speculators, craft, violence, hypocrisy, daring, bribery, corruption. The perfect flower of imperialism proved to be brief in bloom and prodigious in decay. Its withering diseased the world. Yet though Rhodes fell short of his ambition, he won enormous parts of Africa for Britain. These are today almost visibly breaking out of the loosening mosaic of the British Empire.

The life of this megalomaniac who never married, who conceived all things in monstrous sizes, can be understood partially by Freudian analysis, but more completely in relation to the capitalist disorder which encouraged destructive adventures, and which permitted the cruelest exploitation of human masses as well as the most wasteful exploitation of natural resources. The thousands of natives killed by slow abuse in Rhodes's mines, the many more thousands killed in the dishonest wars with the tribes and by the consequent disease and starvation, were sacrifices to the psychosis of a neurotic who received his sanction from a society whose philosophy was chaos.

Only one of these three biographies, Mr. Plomer's, recognizes these realities with any frankness. But Mr. Plomer is too hesitating and vague. He has not the courage to challenge whole-heartedly the tradition of Rhodes. The hero of imperialism proves too formidable for him. Mr. Lockhart, on the other hand, is frankly a hero-worshiper; and the small space at his disposal, in addition, gives him the excuse to omit the crass and indefensible elements in Rhodes's career.

It is Mrs. Millin's biography that is the most annoying. It is the longest and the most pretentious of the three, and the English Book Club, in making it one of its monthly choices, has again rewarded spurious fine writing. The book proceeds on the theory that large and successful actions like those of Rhodes are the workings of genius. Mrs. Millin's melodramatic prose celebrates his genius of action. But after the reverberations of her rhetoric die down, the career as it is presented remains sordid. Mrs. Millin writes at one point: "Rhodes's money was not only, on the whole, put to creditable uses: the opening up of a closed continent; it was, on the whole, fairly made. Nor did he grind the faces of the poor by making diamonds more expensive." But by the evidence Mrs. Millin is obliged to offer Africa was blasted open; Rhodes's money was "fairly" made only by the standards of cutthroat capitalist competition; and the poor, perhaps, were not vitally affected by the price of diamonds. As a matter of fact, Rhodes did grind the faces of petty-bourgeois fiances throughout the world by keeping up the price of diamonds. It was for that purpose that he bought out Barney Barnato's diamond mines after a stock-market battle that was at once spectacular, ludicrous, furtive, and obscene.

ISIDOR SCHNEIDER

Prices and Labor Under the NRA

Business Under the Recovery Act. By Lawrence Valenstein and E. B. Weiss. The McGraw-Hill Company. $2.50.

Labor Relations Under the Recovery Act. By Ordway Tead and Henry C. Metcalfe. The McGraw-Hill Company. $2.

THESE two enterprising volumes attempt to mark out the effects of the NRA upon marketing and labor policies and to outline liberal lines of action for industrialists and employers. Messrs. Valenstein and Weiss see in the recovery act the way to prevent predatory and unfair competition in selling practices which have not been successfully controlled by the Trade Commission Act or by the administrative work of that commission. They list no less than forty of these unfair practices—including price discriminations; the granting of premiums, selling accessories, and hidden demonstrators; the misrepresentation of quality; bribery; espionage; and malicious propaganda against competitors. These, they declare, should be eliminated by the guild-like emphasis which the codes and the governing trade associations should build up. In addition, they hope that the emphasis upon the unity of each industry will check the abuses of competitive advertising and that co-operative advertising may be expected to increase.

It is probable that the NRA will lead to some healthy changes in these directions, and that it will make the relationships between the larger firms within any given industry more sportsman-like and more congenial. This is to the good. But it is at the same time evident that such enthusiasm for the NRA as exists among business leaders is largely due to their belief that it will enable them to combine to boost prices and enjoy monopoly profits. It is more than doubtful whether any adequate provision has been built up within the NRA to check these abuses. Some of the codes, notably those in iron and steel and those proposed for the retail trades, may actually sanction them. As the popular excitement over the NRA abates, it will be more difficult to protect the diffused interests of the consumers from the concentrated and aggressive drives of the various industries for higher prices. There is grave danger, therefore, that the consumer may be the forgotten man of the Recovery Administration.

Messrs. Tead and Metcalfe discuss the proper methods for collective dealing between employers and employed. After outlining the real functions which shop committees can perform, they come out flat-footedly in favor of inter-company unions as better agencies for collective bargaining than the purely plant organizations which are advocated by most employers. The authors correctly point out that shop committees, or company unions, which are primarily dependent on the favor of the employers for existence, cannot fix basic minima for an industry or even effectively adjust serious grievances. Such bodies, with either no funds or severely limited resources, whose representatives are men whose jobs and chances for promotion are also under the control of the employers, cannot adequately represent labor in any real clash of interests. A broader and a completely independent form of organization, such as is embodied in unions admitting all the workers within an industry, is needed if anything approaching equality of bargaining power is to be attained.

As a matter of fact, since the original codes are largely framed in terms of relative pressure and power, the workers fare worse in those industries where they are not organized and best in those industries where they are. It will, moreover, in my opinion, prove impossible to police an industry on labor

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matters and to enforce the codes without strong unions which will investigate and make complaints.

The real success of the NRA hinges, therefore, not only upon the degree to which it will be possible to protect the consumer, but also upon the degree to which it may recognize the fact that unionization is necessary both to preserve a better balance of power and to enforce the rules. Unless this is done, and the consumers are also effectively mobilized, we are likely to find (1) extremely high profits with an attendant maldistribution of purchasing power and the ultimate sure prospect of another severe relapse, and (2) such concentration of power as to make the country even more of an economic and political feudal state than it was during the decade of the twenties.

Whether such will be the ultimate results of the NRA depends on the insight, concern, and energy of all classes who are really anxious about the fundamentals of our common life. If such books as this by Tead and Metcalfe were widely read and acted upon by employers, it would save us from great grief.

PAUL H. DOUGLAS

The Romantic Agony

The Romantic Agony. By Mario Praz. Translated from the Italian by Angus Davidson. Oxford University Press. $7.50.

THE romantic movement, like the "fatal woman" to which it gave birth, has been all things to all men: the social and political historian, the moralist, the sentimental biographer have all had their fling with it and left it at the end as complex a mass of conflicting ideals and tendencies as they found it. It was only natural that a scholar like Mario Praz should come along who, concentrating on its erotic aspects, should offer us something like the psychopathology of the movement. Unlike such hostile critics as Maurras, Seillière, and Massis in France, and Irving Babbitt and Paul Elmer More in this country, the Italian critic interprets romanticism not so much as the result of certain intellectual conceptions of the eighteenth century as of the emergence around that time of a particular kind of sensibility. For Praz the movement consists merely of a group of tendencies and phenomena, all of which existed before, but which recurred at a single time and with such intensity as to constitute an epidemic. Of these tendencies and phenomena, moreover, Praz is concerned only with those which relate to erotic sensibility; his work is, admittedly, a monograph rather than a synthesis.

The key which Praz uses to unlock the romantic sensibility was undoubtedly supplied by Sainte-Beuve in the statement quoted in the text: "I shall dare affirm, without fear of contradiction, that Byron and de Sade . . . have perhaps been the two greatest inspirers of our moderns, the one proclaimed and visible, the other clandestine—not too clandestine." It is more particularly the sometimes transparent, sometimes subterranean influence of the "divine Marquis" which provides the principal subject matter of Praz's darkly laden pages. Before proceeding to exact instances of the influence, however, he prepares us with a chapter which reviews the distorted aesthetic conception which was at its base: the conception of tainted beauty, the beauty of the Medusa, Baudelaire's "something both ardent and sad," which is perhaps most clearly expressed for English readers in Keats's "Ode to Melancholy" and the verse of Poe. Such a conception once absorbed, Praz shows, resulted in a preference and secret admiration for the depraved, the monstrous, and the satanic. In The Metamorphoses of Satan Praz traces out the process by which the Evil One of Tasso and Milton, with his halo of fallen beauty, "majestic though in ruin," shaded into the heroes of eighteenth-century Gothic romance and into the heroes of Byron. In the "fatal men" of such writers as Mrs. Radcliffe and "Monk" Lewis, as well as in the Manfreds, Corsairs, and Laras of Byron, we have the beginnings of that interest in the themes of incest, vampirism, and physical torture which were to be developed so much more frankly by later writers. (Oddly enough, Praz fails to mention Emily Brontë's Heathcliffe among the descendants of this sinister crew.) Byron is for Praz a kind of inferior Sade, anticipating and preparing for the latter's more direct influence in the next generation. Earlier in the eighteenth century, as a matter of fact, the same influence had been anticipated in quite a different school of writing, the sentimental fiction of Richardson and Diderot, who reflected a much too easy complaisance toward the moral and physical sufferings of their heroines. Sadism as a conscious doctrine, however, does not seem to have sifted through into imaginative literature until the 1820's, when Praz would have us believe it swept pretty much everything in its way. It is then to be found not only in the paintings of Delacroix, the poetry of Baudelaire, and the novels of Flaubert, but in a whole body of popular writing by authors whose names are now known only to students of the period. Also, by a curious shift in sensibility which Praz does not explain, the "fatal man" of the earlier period becomes the "fatal woman." The type had of course already existed in myth and poetry long before Keats wrote his "La Belle Dame Sans Merci." But, more strongly perfumed with aestheticism and exoticism, it was now revived by Gautier and Flaubert, brought to its full development by Swinburne, and then bandied about among Pater, Wilde, and D'Annunzio. Swinburne's Dolores, "Our Lady of Pain," represents all the attributes of the type: her intriguing fatality, her promise of death and destruction, her bloodthirsty cruelty. In her sadistic charms is idealized the aspiration of a whole generation to be "the powerless victim of the furious rage of a beautiful woman." (For some reason Praz refuses to assist clarity by using the term "masochism"; nor does he have anything to say about the possible direct influence of Leopold von Sacher-Masoch.) The *fin de siècle* "decadence" which Baudelaire and Swinburne fathered is covered in a chapter entitled Byzantium: "The Byzantine period was a period of anonymous corruption, with nothing of the heroic about it; only there stand out . . . figures such as Theodora and Irene, who are static personifications of the female lust for power." Here the examples of morbidity, hysteria, and goriness collected by Praz are almost sufficient to place the book in the same category as the more clinical works of Ellis and Krafft-Ebing. And here, with such names as D'Annunzio and Gide, we come right into our own time. But while there are references to Proust and the surréalistes there is no extended analysis of either: we are left to make our own observation as to the place the "divine Marquis" occupies in recent literature. Praz is content to halt when he has outlined for us his lengthened shadow on the literature of the last hundred years.

Most of the objections that might be raised to his study are disposed of by Praz in his foreword. He is very careful to state his belief that the impulse to which Sade has given his name was not something invented by Sade, nor something confined to the romantic period alone, but a universal impulse "mysterious as the very forces of life and death with which it is inextricably connected." What one objects to in Praz's study, as a matter of fact, is not any sin of commission, but a very grave sin of omission. The question that Praz fails to consider is why the tendencies which he treats appeared with such intensity at the particular time they did. In brief, he describes a malady without examining its causes. His only answer to Croce's complaint that his approach is too limited and superficial is the exclamation, "What could be more obvious than the attempt to trace the sources of the aberrations of a period to a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

metaphysical crisis!" Obvious, perhaps, but not too obvious for a Baudelaire, writing of the eighteenth century: "The negation of original sin did not count for nothing in the general blindness of this epoch." Nor for a Flaubert, referring to the vogue of Sade: "It's the last word of Catholicism." In fact, Praz himself cannot always escape the metaphysical sources: "Richardson, in consequence of the materialistic philosophy then predominant, was a supporter of the instinct." What does this imply but that there is some connection between the beliefs and convictions of an epoch and its erotic interests and behavior? To assign the latter to taste and fashion, as Praz does, is to be merely superficial; even tastes and fashions have their explanations, however remote, and it is the task of the real critic to discover them for us. But for the critic who will undertake the synthesis that Praz has disdained, his researches will be invaluable; and for others as well, including the literary student and the psychologist, they should prove fascinating and profitable.

WILLIAM TROY

Shorter Notices

The Delicate Fire. By Naomi Mitchison. Harcourt, Brace and Company. $2.50.

There is always a fascination in presenting the life of the past in realistic terms, with a contemporary and colloquial use of language, in order to give the impression that history is only a series of masquerades for the perennial human emotions and situations. This procedure may or may not show a true historic sense, but it has its uses for fiction. One or two of Miss Mitchison's tales of barbaric Greece achieve this sense of contemporaneity; others, because of this very over-simplification and a too liberal use of the colloquial, fall short of the desired effect, and contain the slight elements of burlesque and distortion that one associates with a well-meaning suburban costume-pageant. The greater number of these tales deal with the vicissitudes of a group of Greek captives sold into slavery in Macedonia, their revolt from their masters, and the founding of a communist society among them. In all of them the idea is better than the execution; and one feels the need for a great deal more of objective documentation and historical data to give substance to the liberal and high-minded plea for an emancipated humanity that undoubtedy motivated their telling.

Nazi Culture: The Brown Darkness over Germany. By Matthew Josephson. The John Day Company. 25 cents.

The value of this pamphlet lies in the informative brevity of half a dozen chapters on the spreading cultural darkness under the Nazi regime. Lucidly written, it whets the appetite for more. Mr. Josephson concentrates chiefly on the cultural aspects of the Third Reich and limits his observation to the fantastic book-burning and the exiling of prominent scholars and artists. The more serious student will not find in this poetic and journalistic report a full-size picture of the underlying economic and emotional impulses which led to a crazed idolization of the "leader and savior." He will not find an analysis of the fifteen years of humiliation since the war—the returning soldiers and the sudden dance craze; the "forgetting" period which culminated in sex orgies and the mushroom growth of a so-called "night life"; the catastrophe of an inflation which wiped out the cultured middle class; the invasion of valuta foreigners and the role of the Jews especially during that period; the betrayal of the Social Democrats; the disillusioned masses of the Communist Party after the breakdown of a second revolution during the Seeckt regime; the fifteen years' murder of all revolutionary and liberal-minded leaders and the notorious judicial sympathy with the assassins; the ever-increasing Black Reichswehr and the far-off intellectualism of an uprooted German literature. Unjustly Mr. Josephson concludes his last chapter with a eulogy of Thomas Mann, who with many others could do nothing in such turbulent times but seek refuge in the purified, lofty regions of the Swiss Alps to write an essay about the bloody struggle which is still in progress. Mr. Josephson's pamphlet will be welcomed, however, by many liberal-minded intellectuals.

God's Tenth. By Doreen Wallace. Harper and Brothers. $2.

The collapse of England's agrarian prosperity, with emphasis on the pernicious operation of the tithes, forms the background of this novel of farm life in modern England. In a style unvarnished by fine writing Miss Wallace traces the fortunes of Anthony Harden and his wife from their days of transient prosperity to their final defeat before a hostile nature and the ruthless operation of economic laws. In the amount of documentation that is brought to bear on the situations, and in the realistic presentation of character, Miss Wallace's work stems from the naturalistic school of English fiction. She inh rits from Trollope the small provincial town; but unlike Trollope's, her work is cross-bred with the social consciousness of today. It is a new naturalism, in which the implacable play of economic forces supplants the scientific law of the ninteenth-century novelists.

The Mere Living. By B. Bergson Spiro. Frederick A. Stokes Company. $2.

Exploiting the same technique that Virginia Woolf uses in "Mrs. Dalloway," Miss Spiro has chronicled a single day in the life of a middle-class English family. In the course of their humdrum daily routine, her characters experience the most subtle nuances of consciousness, enjoy profound metaphysical revelations, and live, generally, in a heightened intensity of sensuous perception. "The Mere Living" is the modern novel of sensibility in its most exquisite flower; but it provokes are symptomatic of the decay already latent in this literary form. ing, the poetic flights, as one would a number of unrelated art objects. But one feels also that this very suavity and splendor are symptomatic of the decay already latent in this literary form. The sensibilities that Miss Spiro exploits are the stereotyped and conventionalized idiom of a school; and though different in content from the euphuistic conceit, they convey the same impression of a striving for effect instead of a striving for reality.

Beaver, Kings, and Cabins. By Constance Lindsay Skinner. The Macmillan Company. $2.50.

The romance of the fur trade in America, and particularly in Canada, has inspired Constance Lindsay Skinner to write this account of its origins in colonial history and its development in the course of empire. The book is incurably romantic, which is what gives it both its verve and its shortcomings. Though Miss Skinner is obviously familiar with all the sources of her subject, she does not draw sufficiently on the detailed source material to make her book both scholarly and vivid. She has a certain amount of contempt for meticulous scholarship, and by way of apology for lack of a decent bibliography, she writes: "I think it pointless to print several hundred titles merely as a scholarly gesture." But others who come after Miss Skinner would have welcomed the gesture, for others will come after her. She has written a competent, interesting account of many phases of the fur trade, but there is still room for a history of that influential enterprise which would be more detailed, less excited, and more vivid than the light and colorful book which Miss Skinner has written. Miss Skinner is a novelist and a poet as well as a historian, and she juggles the three interests in an attempt at harmony which results often in sentimental impurity.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Pioneer Histories. The European Nations in the West Indies, 1493-1688. By Arthur Percival Newton. The Macmillan Company. $3.50.

It is an absorbing narrative that Mr. Newton sets down. He could, however, have illuminated the political history more effectively if he had concentrated more on the economic factors in colonization and the economic bases of the piracies and wars that tore the Caribbean in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. He makes three interesting points in this volume: the decisions that determined the history of the West Indies were made on European battlefields rather than at home; Spanish administration was much more forceful and efficient than it is commonly considered; the buccaneers who ravaged the Caribbean coasts were often fulfilling political missions and almost always operating for reputable companies whose shares were held by the most respectable business men in Europe.

Films

Cinema Minus

ONE had nourished such high hopes for the screen version of "The Emperor Jones" that one was perhaps doomed to a certain amount of disappointment. Of all Mr. O'Neill's works it seemed the one most suited for cinematic recreation: its form had, in the first place, been so obviously borrowed from that of the looser medium; and its language, which was continually approximating something like poetry, offered such great possibilities of an even more richly poetic screen translation. Its situation was one of those rare dramatic situations which can stand as objectively symbolical representations of all sorts of vaguely grasped feelings and attitudes. In the story of Brutus Jones, the Pullman porter who retraces the old Greek curve of *hybris* in more or less modern terms, Mr. O'Neill found, for the first and last time, the "objective correlative" (in T. S. Eliot's phrase) for his romantic sentiment of the grandiose quality and scope of American experience. His limitations of intelligence and sensibility did not permit him to make the most of the opportunity; but, within its limits, "The Emperor Jones" was one of the most satisfactory experiments of its experimental period. As much as this, unfortunately, cannot be said of the picture at the Rivoli. The cooperation of Dudley Murphy, who directed the film, DuBose Heyward, who prepared the script, and J. Weldon Johnson, who arranged the musical accompaniment, has only resulted in a commonplace and unimaginative statement of elements that were merely implicit in the O'Neill play. A little "Porgy" and not a little "Nigger Heaven" provide the stuff for building up the Emperor's earlier career in Georgia and Harlem. To Mr. Johnson, whose articulation of folk-rhythms with the action is carefully worked out, belongs the credit for making some of these early sequences—the revival-meeting, for example—at least theatrically effective. In any case, these added portions are considerably more effective than the second half of the picture, which consists of an almost literal reproduction of Mr. O'Neill's text. Here it was that Messrs. Murphy, Heyward, and Johnson should have combined to work out the cinematic—that is, visual-aural—equivalent for O'Neill's quasi-poetic rendition of the Emperor's mental soliloquies, recollections, and hallucinations. Instead, they chose to reduce everything to a concentration on Mr. O'Neill's prose and Mr. Robeson's acting. The principal effect of their being so faithful to Mr. O'Neill, as it happens, is merely to emphasize the defects of his linguistic endowment, the flatness and poverty of his poetic style. And the effect of passing on so much responsibility to Mr. Robeson is merely to give us something that we have already had several times in the past. Of course Mr. Robeson's Emperor is "magnificent." Mr. Robeson has always been magnificent in whatever he has done—even in "Othello." But this magnificence, while it makes the Krimsky-Cochran picture worth seeing at any cost, scarcely leads one to condone its failure to satisfy so many other legitimate expectations.

"The Patriots" (Acme Theater), a Soviet sound picture by a new director named Barnett, deals with the fraternization between Russian and German troops during the last days of the Kerensky regime. The film is badly lighted; some inept cutting has marred its second half; but it is excellent both for its reconstruction of Russian village life before the revolution and for its brutally graphic war sequences. The influence of Pudovkin is evident in the intense characterization of the old shoemaker, torn between traditional race hatred and pride in his occupation, and in the almost preternatural drabness of the provincial backgrounds. But Pabst has undoubtedly determined the style in which the war scenes are treated—a style recalling the newsreel rather than the old-fashioned military panel. There are other good things in "The Patriots"—including a striking use of "contrast montage" in several places—which make the trip to the bazaars of Fourteenth Street decidedly worth taking.

Of the Warner Brothers production "Wild Boys of the Road," which turns out to be a film of unexpected honesty and power, discussion must be postponed until next week. It will be enough for the present to assure those who have been made skeptical by the vulgar exploitation and the lukewarm press reception it has received that it is one of the most exceptional films of the new season.

WILLIAM TROY

Drama

An Event

LAST year the Group Theater got itself involved in financial difficulties which looked very serious indeed. This year it faced a season before the prospects of which the hardiest of managers quailed in his boots, if, indeed, he still had any boots to quail in. But despite all this, the improbable has happened, and the Group reappears at the Broadhurst Theater with an extraordinary production of an extraordinary play called "Men in White." To say that it is by far the best thing which has appeared this season would be praise far too faint; even to say that it may very probably remain the year's most satisfying demonstration of what the theater can do would still be not enough. The thing must, on the contrary, be praised in terms absolute rather than relative. It furnishes an experience which is thrilling and absorbing, genuine and complete.

No one, I think, is likely to accuse me of being usually prejudiced in favor of either the play with a purpose or the good intentions of "experimental" groups with nothing except experimentalism in their favor. Indeed, when I heard in advance that the present play was to deal with a hospital and, more particularly, with the conflict between love and duty in the breast of a young interne, my feelings were largely composed of that resignation to which any dramatic critic must school himself. But "Men in White" stands firmly on its own merits as a dramatic production and needs no apology based upon extraneous considerations. It is not merely "an interesting experiment." Neither is it one of those plays of which we feel that we ourselves could afford to miss it but that the other fellow ought to see it because it "would make him think." It is, on the contrary, so immediately interesting, so completely absorbing, that one forgets to ask whether or not it is "significant"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

□ PLAYS □ FILMS □

The Theatre Guild *presents*
EUGENE O'NEILL'S new play
AH, WILDERNESS!
with George M. Cohan
GUILD THEA. 52nd St., West of B'way. Eves. 8:15
Mats. Thurs. and Sat. at 2:15

AMKINO'S PREMIERE 3rd RECORD WEEK
A Soviet Talking Epic!
"The Patriots"
"A Distinct Gorki Flavor . . . Remarkably interesting."
—*National Board of Review*
ACME THEATRE 4th ST. and Midnight Show Every Saturday
UNION SQ. *Rendezvous of the Intelligentsia*

□ JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH says □

AH, WILDERNESS. Guild Theater. To be reviewed next week.

AMOURETTE. Henry Millers Theater. Play by Clare Kummer, direction by Bulgakov, and acting by Francesca Brunning, the star of "One Sunday Afternoon." Nevertheless, not so good.

A PARTY. Playhouse. Agreeable parlor entertainment in which Mrs. Patrick Campbell gives an imitation of herself trading insults at a soirée with a younger actress said to represent our own Tallulah Bankhead.

AS THOUSANDS CHEER. Music Box. To be reviewed next week.

DOUBLE DOOR. Ritz Theater. Reviewed in this issue.

HEAT LIGHTENING. Booth Theater. Simple but exciting melodrama about two girls and a gas station in the great desert. One of the two things so far most worth seeing.

HOLD YOUR HORSES. Winter Garden. Reviewed in this issue.

MEN IN WHITE. Broadhurst Theater. Reviewed in this issue.

MURDER AT THE VANITIES. New Amsterdam. Unholy mixture of absurd melodrama and routine review. Nevertheless a big success.

ONE SUNDAY AFTERNOON. 48th St. Theater. Pleasant little play held over from last season.

The Only Truly International Magazine
The world's leading minds meet for discussion in
THE MODERN THINKER
Edited by DAGOBERT D. RUNES, Ph.D.
Keep abreast of the new in social science, literature, world politics, education, philosophy, and art
From Current Issues
Must There Be War? ..... *Albert Einstein*
Life 200 Years from Now ..... *H. G. Wells*
National Socialism: a Portrait *Leon Trotsky*
Prospects of Materialism *L. B. S. Haldane*
Who Burned the Reichstag? *Henri Barbusse*
25c at the better newsstands. Send 25c for sample copy or $1.00 for five-month subscription to The Modern Thinker, 310 Riverside Drive, N. Y. C.
Name .....
Address .....

Classified Advertising Rates

Minimum 3 lines..... $1.86

Additional lines of 6 words each ..... $ .62

THE NATION
20 Vesey Street
New York

or "important." And that, I submit, is one of the signs by which a genuine work of art may be recognized.

Most of my confreres on the daily press have agreed with this judgment in advance, and I suspect that after we have had time to think it over we shall continue to agree still further that the effectiveness of the production can be credited less to any one element in it than to its remarkable wholeness, to the way in which everything in the acting and direction, as well as in the script itself, works with everything else to produce an unbroken continuity of interest and to leave behind a complete, unified impression. On the one hand, it can hardly be said that there is anything completely new in the theme or that we have not heard before of the conflict between love and duty as revealed in the life of a young physician. Neither, on the other hand, can it be claimed that the somewhat cinematographic technique is in itself a novelty. Indeed, there is a vague resemblance between this play and such efforts as "Merry-Go-Round" and "Precedent," for the latter of which the firm of Harmon and Ullman (associated with the Group for this production) was responsible. But the resemblance is, after all, as unimportant as the resemblance must always be between something which succeeds and something which fails. Where other plays of the sort were shrill or hysterical, "Men in White" is eloquent with the eloquence of calm understatement. Where the machinery of the others whirred and creaked and groaned, this play moves with a seemingly effortless inevitability. The final result is that one is left, not in a state of vague exasperation, but merely with the sense of having passed through a vivid self-justifying experience. Doubtless this effect is made possible by the fact that Sidney Kingsley, an author hitherto unknown to Broadway, has realized the necessity of resolving the emotional discords and has made the audience feel that the tragic triumph of his hero is worth his struggles and his partial defeat. But it is due also to a production in which competence and fire are combined to an extent perhaps possible only to an organization which has had enough experience to know what it is doing but not so much as to have lost the enthusiasm of youth.

Under the circumstances it is hardly worth while to pick out individual incidents or persons for commendation, but it is impossible not to mention the moment when J. Edward Bromberg, as the old doctor, turns aside at the point of highest tension to admire a specimen in a bottle on the table, or not to cite the whole scene in the operating room as one of the finest examples of realism touched with imagination ever seen on our stage. As for the acting, it is, for the most part, superb—especially in the persons of Mr. Bromberg and Alexander Kirkland. Not since the Theater Guild *grew* up and the Neighborhood Playhouse *gave* up, has any non-commercial organization so triumphantly justified its existence as the Group Theater here does. "Men in White" is another feather for a cap already adorned with a goodly number of trophies.

A busy week brought five other productions, of which only two can be mentioned now. "Double Door" (Ritz Theater) is an exciting melodrama obviously suggested by the Wendel case. The colors are laid on pretty thick but the excitement is genuine even if, after it is all over, one doubts just how seriously one should have taken it. "Hold Your Horses" (Winter Garden) has Joe Cook with his engaging grin of amiable madness and several of those vastly elaborate inventions of the sort which Rube Goldberg used to imagine but which only Mr. Cook ever undertook to realize in all their cumbersome inefficiency. The dancing is good, and one mad scene in which Mr. Cook's assistant, the amusing Dave Chasen, is finally precipitated down a chute into a waiting crate of toy balloons, is insanely funny. It must be confessed, however, that between the high spots "Hold Your Horses" is only a so-so review.

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED